

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXVIII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 110.

---

## I.—TRANSPOSITION VARIANTS IN CICERO'S VERRINES.

Even if we omit minor instances, and cases where the divergence is between inferior MSS only, there are over four hundred and fifty places in the Verrines where our standard codices differ from each other as to the order in which the words should be arranged. What is the explanation of this phenomenon? It cannot be altogether due to accident. When we have placed the rival readings over against each other, supported each by the authority of MSS whose general character is now more or less fully known, can we decide with any degree of certainty which was the original order, as set down by Cicero, and which the inversion of a copyist?

Considerations of prose-rhythm must have entered very largely into these discrepancies. Cicero's order may have been perverted, in places, with the view of illustrating some law of rhythm which the copyist had in mind at the time of writing. The result was very often to obscure the rhythm intended by the orator. The early editors were aware of this: in his edition of 1540, J. Sturm speaks of 'numerus transpositione verborum divulsus'. Or again an inversion may have been effected from the wish to exemplify some grammatical rule or figure. A scribe may have had a fixed idea, for example, as to the proper position of words like *iste* and *etiam*, and have altered his text accordingly. At III, § 162, the received text runs *ut inimicus neque deesse nocenti possit neque obesse innocenti*. When we find a late 15th century MS, like Lg. 29, altering this collocation to *nocenti deesse*, we know that the motive must have been to produce a kind of chiasmus. With the same motive, at II § 34, we find the copyist of Lg. 42 substituting *ex negotiatoribus propositi* for *propositi ex*

*negotiatoribus*. The attempt to avoid hiatus will be recognised as having furnished another motive, which accounts for a considerable number of transpositions.

The criticism of the Verrines must henceforward, for reasons which have been stated in previous papers,<sup>1</sup> deal with the earlier books, and Books IV-V, as one continuous whole: the emergence of the Cluniacensis, and its proved relation to Lg. 42, make it necessary to treat separately the Second and Third Books of the *Actio Secunda*. The object of the following paper is to give a full list of the numerous transposition variants, quoting first in order the reading which on diverse grounds I propose to accept as correct, and which will accordingly appear in the text of my forthcoming volume in the Oxford Classical Series: thereafter are cited the variations, with the MS authority for each.

It should be premised that in addition to the fragments of the Vatican palimpsest (V) I deal, for the first part of the research, with two main families of MSS, which are designated respectively  $\psi$  and  $\pi$ . To the former belong, for the earlier books, Par. 7775 (S), Par. 7823 (D), and the various MSS cited in the Zürich edition, including, for Books IV-V, the Regius Parisinus 7774 A, which is called R: to these I have added Harl. 4105 (K), and Harl. 4852 (Z). The  $\pi$  family includes primarily Par. 7776 (p), along with Lg. 29 (q), and Harl. 2687 (r): but with these may be conjoined the 13th cent. Paris MS 4588 (k) and the later Lg. 6 (b). These are the forerunners of the dett. ( $\delta$ ). For Books II and III our main authorities are, in addition to V and  $\pi$ , the Cluni codex now in Lord Leicester's library at Holkham, and its copy or derivative Lg. 42, which I cite as O, and of which the official description is Flor. Bad. 2618 (79). To include most codd., in addition to such as may be specially cited, a convenient sign is  $\omega$ .

The references which follow are throughout to the pages of Müller's Teubner Text.

*Div. in Caecil.*

100, 3 *ita sim . . . . ut D $\psi$*  *sim ita . . . . ut  $\pi$*

Such transpositions of *ita* are especially frequent. Cp. the following:

215, 19 *ita istum* codd. praeter O (*istum ita*).

235, 32 *ita rem . . . . quemadmodum Vqr* : *rem ita . . . . qu.* Op, and ed. Rom. 1471.

<sup>1</sup> See especially the Journal of Philology (London), Vol. XXX, pp. 161 sqq.

- 245, 21 *scriptum ita est* codd. plerique : *ita scriptum est* O.
- 253, 32 *ita eos abs te institui . . . ut* pb al. : *eos abs te ita* O.
- 269, 20 *tum (tunc) ita . . . ut* p rell. : *ita tum . . . ut* O.
- 277, 33 *Cum haec essent ita constituta* ω : *ita essent* V sol.
- 328, 37 *nisi ita res manifesta erit allata ut* p et vulg. (recte) : *ita ante allata* O, post *allata* Lamb.
- 344, 24 *aequum ita est solvi* ω : *est ita* O.
- 101, 1 *suarum fortunarum* ω (295, 32) : *fort. suar.* (sed cum signis transp., ut 109, 5) D, itemque G<sub>1</sub>LK.
- 101, 21 *habere eos* prð ed. Rom., et ita Quint. IX, 2, 59 (cf. 471, 28) : *eos habere* DΨ.
- 102, 20 *solacium exitii quaerunt* DΨ : *ex. sol. quaerunt* prð ed. Rom.
- 106, 29 *potius ab hoc quam* DΨ : *ab hoc potius quam* prð ed. Rom. (329, 11).
- 109, 5 *tua ista accusatio* ω (239, 23 : 483, 26) : *ista tua acc.* D (sed cum signis transp.), G<sub>1</sub>K ed. Rom.
- 116, 32 *dicturum te esse audio* D al., ed. Rom. : *te* om. p, dein eadem manus inseruit ante *dicturum*, et ita *te dicturum* qrG<sub>1</sub>L.
- 117, 21 *posse reperiri* ω ed. Rom. : *reperiri posse* pqr.
- 117, 23 *si iure posses eum accusare* DΨ : *iure eum posses* pð : *eum iure posse(s)* r. Is *eum* an adscript?

#### *Actio Prima.*

- 126, 8 *nulla res tam patria cuiusquam* D al. p. Here the later hand in p (=p<sup>2</sup>) has inserted a second *cuiusquam* before *tam*,—an emendation made in accordance with what became a common reading (q<sub>2</sub> ed. Rom.) : r follows faithfully with *cuiusquam tam patria cuiusquam*.
- 131, 9 *innocente homine* DΨ : *homine innocente* πbð ed. Rom. (193, 18 : 401, 29).
- 132, 2 *prope toto commutato consilio* DG<sub>1</sub> : *prope consilio toto commutato* πb D<sup>2</sup>K : *prope toto cons. comm.* rell. praeter Z, in quo est *toto prope comm. cons.*
- 134, 3 *aut accipere aut recipere* π Ps. Asc. : *aut recipere aut accipere* DΨb ed. Rom.

- 136, 7 *tempus hoc vobis divinitus datum esse (divinitus vobis LKs) Dψ : tempus opportunissimum vobis hoc divinitus d. e. pbrδ ed. Rom.*  
 136, 17 *fortissimo et clarissimo Dψb ed. Rom. : clar. et fort. pqr (Rosc. § 6).*

*Act. Sec. Lib. I.*

- 146, 1 *quisquam iudices Dψ : iudices quisquam πb ed. Rom.*  
 For similar inversions of *iudices*, which naturally comes after the emphatic word, cf. 272, 16: 279, 9: 293, 27: 302, 22: 334, 13: 351, 4: 428, 7: 497, 9.  
 157, 6 *est mihi alius locus Pal. Taur., Asc. : est alius mihi locus Dψp et pler., ed. Rom.*  
 157, 9 *dictum est hoc Pal. Taur. b : d. hoc est π ed. Rom. (om. Dψ).*  
 160, 1 *suo artificio Dψ : artificio suo pbδ ed. Rom. (suo om. Ps. Asc., Schol. Gron.).*  
 161, 25 *iudiciorum se dominos dici Dp et pler. : se iud. d. d. Ps. Asc., Schol. Gron. : iud. dominos se dici ed. Rom.*  
 164, 11 *munus illud suum non esse DZ πb ed. Rom. : illud munus suum n. e. G<sub>2</sub>K : munus suum illud n. e. G<sub>1</sub>.*  
 165, 25 *Postridie homines mane Dψ : Postridie mane hom. pδ ed. Rom.*  
 166, 32 *militum tribunus Dψ : tribunus militum p (errant Zumpt et Iord.) rb.*  
 167, 33 *reperire neminem poterat πb ed. Rom. (Zielinski, p. 193) : nem. rep. pot. Dψ.*  
 174, 33 *homines formosos DZ pb ed. Rom. : formosos homines S (sed cum signis transp., ut 179, 16: 371, 2: 424, 3) G<sub>2</sub>K.*  
 179, 16 *audaciam amentiamque prb K ed. Rom. : amentiam audaciamque SD (sed cum signis transp.) ZG<sub>1</sub>λ.*  
 181, 17 *inventus est V sol. : est inventus SDpω ed. Rom.*  
 181, 27 *cui satis non fuerit V sol. : cui non satis f. πb ed. Rom.*  
 181, 31 *tu tibi V : tibi tu πb. Desinunt iam in l. 24 huius paginae Dψ.*  
 182, 34 *hominis aliud π : aliud hominis bδ ed. Rom.*  
 185, 22 *iste virgis Vpqr : virgis iste bδ ed. Rom.*  
 186, 16 *homo sit heres V : sit homo heres pω ed. Rom.*  
 186, 19 *ut ego non dicam, pecuniam intercessisse . . . declarat V : ut ego pecuniam non dicam inter., . . . declarat prω ed. Rom.*

- 187, 6 *in causa aequissima fuit* V : *fuit in causa aeq.* pr  
(204, 9).  
187, 36 *Recita Cn. Faeni testimonium* V : *Recita test. Cn.*  
*Faen.* pb ed. Rom.  
188, 8 *Ne Tadii quidem tabulis* V : *Ne tabulis quidem Quinti*  
(Q.) *Tadii* p et pler.  
190, 18 *esse optimum factu* prb : *optimum esse factu* ed. Rom.  
vulg.  
193, 18 *illius iniquissimi hominis* V : *ill. hom. iniq.* p<sub>w</sub> ed.  
Rom. (131, 9).  
195, 21 *praetextatum venisse* V : *venisse praetextatum* pr<sub>w</sub> ed.  
Rom.  
198, 15 *cui ego nisi* V : *cui nisi ego* p<sub>w</sub> ed. Rom. (223, 3).

This concludes the enumeration of instances up to the end of the First Book of the Second Actio. The re-establishment of the authority of the Vatican Palimpsest (Am. J. Ph. XXVI, pp. 409-436) lends weight to the readings of its surviving fragments, as quoted for the latter part of this book. In the last eight or nine places, it seems safest to follow the tradition of V, and here p may have been the inverter. But we must be careful not to lose sight of the probability that a large corpus of speeches like the Verrines may have been differently dealt with at different places by various readers or revisers, and it would not be safe to infer that p is the transposer throughout. What V would have shown, if it had survived, in the earlier passages, especially where there is a divergence between  $\pi$  and D $\Psi$ , can only be conjectured.

In view of the relationship which has been proved to exist among the extant MSS of the Verrines, the criticism of the earlier books may be considered as continuous with that of Books IV and V,—that of the intervening portion contained in Books II-III being reserved for separate treatment. A full list of transposition variants is accordingly submitted here for Books IV and V:—

#### Book IV.

- 365, 36 *hospes esset* VSDK : *esset hospes* RZ pr ed. Rom.  
366, 17 *Messanam cum imperio nemo* R<sub>s</sub>SDZ : *nemo Messanam*  
*cum imperio* V p<sub>d</sub> ed. Rom. : *Mess. nemo cum imp.*  
K (fort. recte).  
366, 26 *cuiquam praeterea* VR $\pi$  : *praeterea cuiquam* SD $\Psi$ , ed.  
Rom., ed. Venet. 1483.

- 366, 27 *istius domus* V (Zielinski, p. 196) : *domus istius* RSD p, al., Non., ed. Rom.
- 369, 33 *habuisse illa* V  $\pi$ δK ed. Rom. : *illa habuisse* RSDZ.
- 370, 15 *de pecuniis repetundis* VRp, ed. Rom. : *de repet. pec.* SG<sub>λ</sub>.
- 371, 2 *ista laudatio* VRp ed. Rom. : *laudatio ista* S (sed cum signis transp.) D $\Psi$  (174, 33: 494, 23).
- 371, 27 *ex foedere debuisti* Rp ed. Rom. : *debuisti ex foedere* SD $\Psi$ .
- 379, 10 *iam non* RH<sup>1</sup> p ed. Rom. : *non iam* SD $\Psi$ .
- 379, 36 *erepta sibi vasa optime facta dicebat*  $\omega$ , ed. Rom. : *e. s. vasa facta dic. optime* p<sup>1</sup> : *e. s. vasa facta opt. dic.* p<sup>2</sup>q.
- 387, 11 *me nunc de Verre dicere*  $\omega$  : *nunc de Verre me dicere* p (me om. ed. Rom.).
- 387, 30 *litteras ad quos solebat misit* R al. : *ad quos sol. litt. misit* S in mg., G<sub>3</sub>K.
- 389, 19 *credo satis* RHp ed. Rom. : *satis credo* D $\Psi$ .
- 392, 24 *Tuus enim honos*  $\omega$  : *tuus enim est honos* pq : *tuus est enim honos*  $\delta$  ed. Rom.
- 395, 31 *eversurum esse illam* RSH (240, 36) : *illam eversurum esse* p $\delta$ .
- 397, 25 *nec solum . . . . sed etiam eorum* SD al.  $\delta$  ed. Rom. (470, 18) : *eorum etiam* R (463, 32) : *etiam* om. pq.
- 401, 29 *"innocentē in hominem* RS : *in innoc. in hom.* D $\Psi$  : *in hom. innoc. p* : *inn. in hom.* Z (131, 9: 193, 18).
- 402, 21 *igitur tibi nunc* R : *nunc igitur tibi* SD $\Psi$  : *tibi* om. pq : *nunc* om. ed. Rom.
- 405, 11 *mihi non modo breviter* Rp al. : *non modo breviter mihi* S $\Psi$  (428, 7).
- 407, 10 *fuisse putatis (putastis)*  $\omega$  : *putastis fuisse* pq : (*fuisse feminam put.* K).
- 409, 14 *orbem omnem* R : *orbem omnium* p $\delta$  : *omnem orbem* SD $\Psi$ .
- 410, 14 *Tanta enim erat* SD $\Psi$  p $\delta$  : *Tanta erat enim* R. Cp. 392, 24: also the following places: 279, 20: 285, 34: 307, 5: 341, 5: 353, 3: 369, 5: 458, 13.
- 411, 9 *gemitus fletusque fiebant* RSD : *fletus gemitusque fiebant* p $\delta$ , Martianus Capella (v. § 163: Rosc. § 24).
- 414, 14 *una via lata*  $\omega$  : *una lata via* p $\delta$ .

<sup>1</sup>H = Codex Harleianus 2682, olim Coloniensis Basilicanus.

- 414, 31 *aedificiis omnibus publicis privatis* pδ : *aed. publicis omnibus privatis* RSψ. Here one of Lambinus's codd. (λ) is reported as giving *et privatis*, and perhaps *privatis* is an adscript.
- 415, 25 *victoria illa sua* Rψ : *illa victoria sua* p al. : *sua* om. δ.
- 419, 3 *Syraculis abstulit* pδ (Zielinski V<sub>2</sub>) : *abstulit Syraculis* Rψ (*abs. Syracusanis* q).
- 419, 10 *tandem dolore eos* Rψ : *tandem eos dolore* pq : *dolore tandem eos* K.
- 419, 25 *credite hoc mihi* Rψ : *credite mihi hoc* pG<sub>1</sub> al.
- 420, 29 *existimare hoc volo* RSDψ (fort. *existimari* ?) : *existimare vos hoc volo* p : *exist. hoc vos volo* δ.
- 421, 36 *totius provinciae ad me* R ω : *totius ad me* prov. π.
- 422, 22 *consilii negotiique* R ω : *negotii consilii* KZ.
- 424, 3 *Quid est hoc* RG<sub>1</sub>q : *Quid hoc est* SG<sub>2</sub>L : (S with faint transposition marks, as at 174, 33). Cp. 298, 32 : 383, 4.
- 424, 6 *illi ipsi tui convivae* R ω : *ipsi illi t. c.* pδ. (Cp. 216, 28 : 356, 26 : 446, 3 : 473, 16).
- 425, 17 *multo labore meo* R ω : *labore meo multo* Sψ.
- 426, 1 *ipsorum Syracusanorum* R al. : *Syr. ipsorum* Sψ : *Syr.* om. pq. Perhaps *Syracusanorum* is an adscript.

## Book V.

- 428, 6 *eius defensio ostenditur* Rp al. : *defensio eius ost.* Sψ.
- 428, 7 *mihi ante est indices* R al. (405, 11) : *ante est mihi* (om iud.) Sψ (146, 1).
- 433, 17 *ad fortunas omnium pertinerent* R al : *ad omnium fort. pert.* Sψ. (Zielinski's V<sub>3</sub> v. V<sup>3</sup>). Cp. 479, 9.
- 442, 4 *videntur esse* R al. : *esse videntur* Sψ. Cp. 222, 4.
- 446, 3 *ab ipsis istis Mamertinis tuis laudatoribus* R al. : *ab istis ipsis tuis Mamertinis laudatoribus* pkδ. (For *ipsis istis* cp. 424, 6).
- 446, 19 *ipsorum ex litteris* R al. : *ex ipsorum litt.* Sψ.
- 450, 27 *provinciae spolia portaret* R ω : *spolia prov. port.* SG<sub>2</sub> al.
- 455, 2 *erant capti* RSψp : *capti erant* V.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This reading might be accepted, out of compliment to the antiquity of V. But in view of the aberration which follows, only a few lines further down, it seems safer to conclude that the reading given in V is an inversion of the original order.

- 455, 15 *capitibus obvolutis e carcere* RS $\Psi$ p : *involutis e carcere capitibus* V.
- 456, 8 *continuit populus Romanus se* R  $\omega$  : *se cont. pop. Rom.* p (*cont. se. pop. Rom.* q).
- 456, 17 *crimen et iudicium* R $\omega$  : *iudicium et crimen* p.
- 458, 13 *volo enim esse* SD  $\omega$  : *volo esse enim* R (sed cum signis transp.) pqr : 410, 14.
- 458, 13 *totum mihi* RSD : *mihi totum* pqk.
- 458, 36 *etiam libertus*  $\omega$  : *libertus etiam* k (463, 32).
- 459, 7 *Cleomenes vir* RS $\Psi$ p : *vir Cleomenes* V.
- 459, 21 *tamen animo* R $\Psi$  al. : *animo tamen* Vp $\delta$ .
- 460, 7 *haec ego ad* R $\Psi$  : *ego haec ad* V : *haec omnia ad* pk.
- 461, 31 *res se habebat* R $\Psi$  : *sese res hab.* p $\delta$  : *res sese hab.* q.
- 463, 32 *non modo . . . verum etiam hac* VpYZ al. : *hac etiam* RSDG<sub>1</sub>. Cp. 397, 25.
- 464, 17 *myoparonibus parvis* R et pler. : *parvis myop.* V sol.
- 466, 13 *de se sermones* vulg. : *se* (ante S*Ermones*) om. R<sup>1</sup>p : *sermones de se* S $\Psi$ . (Cp. 442, 36).
- 468, 24 *commoti nuntio* Vp $\delta$  : *nuntio commoti* RS $\Psi$ . (Zielinski V<sub>1</sub> v. S<sub>1</sub>).
- 468, 24 *aspiciunt catenis* RS al. : *catenis asp.* VK.
- 468, 37 *causa indicta* R  $\omega$  : *indicta causa* V sol.
- 469, 3 *patris lacrimae* Vp : *lacrimae patris* RS $\Psi$ .
- 470, 18 *etiam illud* RK : *illud etiam* S $\Psi$ . (458, 36).
- 471, 11 *in tantam* V p $\delta$  : *tantam in* RS $\Psi$  : (*in* om. G<sub>2</sub>).
- 471, 28 *sunt haec* V pk $\delta$  and Quintilian (VIII, 4, 19) : *haec sunt* RS $\Psi$ .
- 471, 31 *est* Vpk $\delta$ , and Quint. : om. RS $\Psi$ .  
It is to be noted that throughout this passage Quintilian seems to have had the Vp tradition before him.
- 472, 9 *cibum tibi* RS p $\delta$  : *tibi cibum vestitumque* V : (*tibi* om. Quint.).
- 472, 11 *adferam mortem filio tuo* R $\omega$  : *mortem filio tuo adferam* V.
- 472, 30 *ne hoc posses* RS : *hoc ne possis* p $\delta$ .
- 473, 16 *neque tibi neque illis* RSK : *neque illis neque tibi* V : *neque tibi*  $\delta$ .
- 473, 16 *ex ipso illo* R $\omega$  : *ex illo ipso* V p $\delta$ .
- 473, 31 *vos quoque hic*, etc., Vp al. : *vos hic quoque* RS $\Psi$ . Cp. 261, 5.
- 475, 3 *populi causa* RS $\Psi$  : *causa PR* V : *causa populi*  $\delta$ .

- 475, 8 *non argentum non aurum* RS $\Psi$  p $\delta$  : *non aurum non argentum* Vq.  
 475, 12 *ita velit fieri* V sol. (Zielinski, p. 198): *ita fieri velit* R $\omega$ . Cp. 255, 21; 338, 23.  
 477, 30 *non ego nego securi* V : *non ego securi nego*  $\delta$  (desunt R $\Psi$ ).  
 478, 2 *hoc Amestratini hoc Herbitenses* R $\omega$  : *hoc Herb. hoc Amestr.* V $\delta$ .  
 479, 1 *cum tibi haec diceret* R p al. : *cum diceret tibi haec* S $\Psi$ .  
 479, 8 *ab quaestore et ab legato* R $\omega$  : *ab legato et quaestore* S $\Psi$ .  
 479, 9 *ab oculis omnium* R $\omega$  : *ab omnium oculis* p (433, 17).  
 480, 34 *ulla possit esse* R $\omega$  : *possit ulla esse* pq : *possit esse ulla*  $\delta$ .  
 481, 14 *iam (tam SD) saepe* RSD al. : *saepe iam* p : *saepe om.* q.  
 483, 26 *istis defensoribus tuis* R al. : *istis tuis defens.* SD $\Psi$ .  
 484, 10 *Quot bella . . . arbitramini* R $\omega$  : *Quot bella arbitramini* . . . . SD $\Psi$ .  
 490, 16 *esse me dicam* pq : *me esse dicam*  $\delta$  edd.  
 490, 29 *se civem esse Romanum* p $\omega$  : *se civ. Rom. esse* q.  
 494, 23 *ornamenta ista* R $\omega$  : *ista ornamenta* pq (371, 2).  
 496, 3 *ego hoc onus* RSDq : *hoc ego onus* p $\delta$  (271, 34, 36).  
 497, 9 *mihi iudices optatum illud est* RSD : *optandum mihi iudices illud est*  $\pi$  (*iudices om.* q) : *iudices optandum est illud*  $\delta$ .  
 497, 30 *manibus regis* q  $\lambda$  : *manis regibus* R : *magnis regibus* SD $\Psi$  : *regis manibus* pk $\delta$ .  
 499, 1 *ab isto uno* R : *ab uno isto* SD $\Psi$ .

The 130 variants set forth in the foregoing list are obviously in themselves of no great importance, but they may be made to throw some light on the history of the constitution of the text, and on the inter-relationship of the MSS. Though not so numerous as those with which we shall have to deal in a separate examination of Books II–III, they are of too frequent occurrence to be considered merely accidental. The probability is that many of them are due to the individuality of some copyist, or copyists, who either simply wished to differentiate their version by giving effect to some personal preference, or sought to illustrate by their transpositions some law of prose rhythm.

A considerable block of instances should, however, be eliminated where a divergence in the order seems to have been caused by the inadvertent omission of a word and its subsequent restor-

ation by different scribes in different places. As obvious or probable examples of this phenomenon, the following places may be studied: 116, 32: 366, 17: 397, 25: 402, 21: 420, 29: 426, 1: 456, 8: 463, 32: 466, 13: 472, 9: 473, 16: 481, 14: 490, 29.

In regard to all the variants, it will be seen at a glance that the fragments of the Vatican palimpsest (V) are of primary importance. The general characteristics of this codex have been fully dealt with in a former paper (*American Journal of Philology*, XXVI, p. 409 sqq.). Its age is in its favour: it belongs to the 4th century, and may be said to represent what came to be the vulgate at the earliest point of departure. The evidence seems, in fact, to show that V embodies the tradition which Quintilian had before him, when he made his quotations from the Verrine orations. Just as editors have followed the extant fragment of the Turin palimpsest, on the ground of its antiquity, in two places (157, 6 and 9), so it seems probable that the reading of V should be accepted at 181, 17, 27, 31: 366, 27: 468, 24: and 475, 12. In these last three passages Zielinski prefers, as has been noted *ad loc.*, the rhythm of V: cp. 167, 33. The following seem to be indifferent and inconclusive: 464, 17: 468, 37: 472, 11. The difficulty is that V is found in agreement sometimes with the  $\Psi$  family, at the head of which stand S and D, sometimes with p and the other members of the group which I have included under the sign  $\pi$ . With 366, 26 (where Vp are reinforced by R) may be compared 369, 33: 459, 21: 463, 32: 468, 24: 469, 3: 471, 11 and 28: 473, 16. At 473, 31 Vp are undoubtedly right, as against mistakes in R and  $\Psi$ : cp. 414, 31. On the other hand in places where p sides with RS against V, the reading of V may be considered doubtful: 455, 12, (especially with l. 15 following): 459, 7: 460, 7: 475, 8.

As to the comparative authority of R and S (*v. Engl. Journ. Phil.* XXX, p. 195 sqq.), in places where there seems little to choose between two different collocations, R is on the whole to be preferred to S: e. g., 371, 27: 379, 10: 389, 19: 405, 11: 409, 14: 425, 17: 428, 6, 7: 433, 17: 442, 4: 446, 19: 450, 27: 479, 1. In all these passages R is reinforced by p. On the other hand p supports the order of S at 410, 14. And S undoubtedly influenced later tradition more than R did: the formula  $S\Psi$  is of more frequent occurrence than  $R\Psi$ . For *exx.* cp. 370, 15: 371, 2.

We may now go back to Books II and III. The criticism of this portion of the Verrines depends on (1) the extant parts of the Cluniacensis (C): (2) the tradition of the same codex, as it

may be recovered from Lg. 42 (O) and other witnesses: (3) the vulgate, introduced by Par. 7776 (p): and (4) the fragments of the Vaticanus (V).

Let us deal first with the extant portions of C (pp. 202-209, p. 240 and pp. 259-265). So far as concerns transposition variants, the following is the complete list of divergences. It should be premised that where the first hand in Lg. 42 is expressly cited (O'), the reading was afterwards altered, by the same or by a later hand, into conformity with the vulgate.

- 202, 2 *vos propinquis* CO' : *propinquis vos* p rell.  
 203, 8 *ex tota provincia homines nobilissimi* CO : *hom. ex tota prov. nob.* p rell.  
 203, 13 *iam liberius apud vos* CO' : *liberius apud vos iam* p rell. : 310, 10.  
 203, 16 *umquam ulla* C rell. (205, 16) : *nulla* (n del. m. 2) *umquam* O, sed. corr. m. 1.  
 204, 9 *Mamertinis erga istum sint* CO' : *sint Mam. erga istum* p rell. (187, 6).  
 204, 33 *negotiantur in Sicilia* CO : *in Sic. negot.* p rell., corr. O m. 1.  
 205, 3 *esse aliis* CO : *aliis esse* p rell.  
 205, 16 *in re umquam ulla* CO : *ulla in re umquam* p rell., corr. O m. 1 (203, 16).  
 206, 27 *tamen putabat* CO : *putabat tamen* p rell., corr. O m. 1. (225, 20 : 301, 33).  
 207, 18 *hoc aures tuae* Vp rell. : *auris hoc tuae* CO'.  
 208, 4 *Quae ista defensio est?* CO p al. : *Quae est ista defensio?* ed. Rom. 1471.  
 208, 5 *res nova est* CO p al., ed. Rom. : *nova res est* vulg.  
 208, 8 *causas obtinebant* p al. (Zielinski p. 193) : *obtenebant causas* CO'.  
 208, 21 *accensi medici* CO' : *medici accensi* p rell.  
 209, 5 *nostros comites* C p al. : *comites nostros* O'. (This I take to be one of several instances of unwarranted aberration on the part of the writer of Lg. 42).  
 209, 16 *tu hoc a me* CO' al. : *tu a me hoc* p rell.  
 240, 24 *dies festi aguntur* C (*agitantur* Vp rell. : 255, 31) : *festi dies aguntur* O (sed corr. m. 1).  
 240, 36 *se funditus eversas esse* CO (prob. Ziel. p. 194) *se eversas funditus esse* V : *funditus eversas esse* (om. se) p rell. (395, 31).

- 241, 9 *Faciunt hoc homines* CO : *fac. homines hoc* q et al.: habent  
Vp<sup>2</sup> *hoc* sup. lin. : om. b ed. Rom.
- 241, 16 *Veneri potissimum* codd. praeter V (*hostissimum*  
*Veneri*).
- 259, 4 *ne minus triginta* CO : XXX *ne minus* p al.
- 259, 21 *statuae eius* CO : *eius statuae* p rell.
- 259, 22 *venio* (=vento) aut C : aut nemo O, but with transposi-  
tion marks.
- 259, 26 *Centuripinos reponere* CO : *reponere Centuripinos* p rell.
- 259, 37 *civium esse* CO : *esse civium* p (*esse* om. δ).
- 260, 8 *ego eas* CO : *eas ego* p rell.
- 261, 5 *vobis quoque* CO p al.: *quoque vobis* V, ed. Rom. Cp.  
352, 5: 473, 31: Rosc. § 82.
- 261, 25 *tu auctoritate* VCO : *auct. tu* p rell.
- 262, 9 *isti ipsi* CO : *ipsi isti* p ed. Rom. (356, 26).
- 262, 12 *familiaritatem tantam* CO : *tant. fam.* p rell.
- 262, 26 *ille etiam* CO : *etiam ille* p al. (et ita primo O : corr. m. 1.)
- 263, 3 *caput suum aut existimationem* CO' : *suum caput atque*  
*exist.* p rell.
- 264, 11 *crimen hoc* CO : *hoc crimen* p rell.
- 264, 18 *ista mihi* Cp : *mihi ista* O rell. ed. Rom.
- 265, 14 *iam hoc me tacito* p et plerique codd. (*hoc* om. b ed.  
Rom.) : *me iam hoc tacito* CO.
- 265, 30 *teneri videbitis* p rell. (Zielinski, p. 194) : *videbitis teneri*  
CO.

So far as this list goes, we might be somewhat doubtful as to the authority of the Cluniacensis. It might even be argued that C was the transposer, not p, or one of the ancestors of p. The reader will note that the authority of V is, for the above passages, inconclusive as between CO and the p family. It is on other variations, apart from transpositions, that we must rely to prove the general superiority of the C tradition. These will be duly recorded in my forthcoming edition of the text, in the Oxford Classical Series. Meanwhile it should be noted that the version contained in O is not in all points an accurate transcription of C. The sequel will show a still greater number of instances where the copyist of O made transpositions on his own account. He was a fifteenth century scholar, who found it easy to make obvious corrections where the writer of C had erred: this seems to me to cover the instances of divergence on which Mr. A. C. Clark has partly relied for his argument that O was not, as I have

maintained, directly copied from C (Class Rev. XVI, p. 325). Moreover, the writer of O had before him a MS of the p family, as well as C, and his doubts as to the propriety of departing from what was then the vulgate are evidenced by the way in which he so frequently corrects what he has transcribed from C into conformity with the more usual version.

The lost parts of the Cluniacensis can be restored, not only from its copy O, but also from the so-called Nannianus (N), the Fabricianus (F), and the Metellianus (M). Here my symbol will be c; and I now proceed to append the remarkably long list of transposition variants for those parts of Books II and III which no longer survive in the Cluniacensis as we have it today. The general argument will follow by way of conclusion.

210, 15 *Decreta eius modi* codd. praeter O (*Eius modi decreta*).

This is one of a whole block of instances where Müller follows O against all the codd. To me this appears a very doubtful procedure. We cannot infer with any certainty that the order of words in O is that which would have been found in the Cluniacensis, if that valuable codex had come down to us intact, firstly because cases have just been cited where O makes a gratuitous departure from C as we actually have it (v. supra, 203, 16: 209, 5: 240, 24: 259, 22: 264, 18), and secondly because if the reading just cited, and many other transpositions of the same class, had appeared in C, they would certainly have been chronicled by Nannius, or Fabricius, or Metellus.

210, 33 *conventu civium Romanorum* VO: *civ. Rom. conv.* p al., ed. Rom.

211, 4 *civem suum* codd. praeter V (*suum civem*).

211, 13 *propositi ex negotiatoribus* V et rell. praeter O (*ex negot. prop.*).

211, 31 *argenti optimi* codd. praeter O (*optimi argenti*). These instances are noteworthy. The former is a gratuitous inversion by O: if it had stood so in C, the variant would have been reported by Nannius, or Fabricius, or Metellus. The latter is even more decisive. Instead of *plena domus caelati argenti optimi*, O gives, omitting *domus* by accident, *plena caelatia optimi argenti*, i. e., the *a* in *caelatia* seems to show that the copyist began to write *a]rgenti*, and then arbitrarily changed the order.

- 211, 35 *Heraclio pecuniam* codd. praeter O (*pecuniam Heraclio*).
- 212, 4 *quidam erant* p et pler. : *erant quidam* O (so also q.)
- 212, 14 *negent ex testamento* codd. praeter O (*ex test. neg.*).
- 213, 14 *ius esse certum* codd. praeter O (*certum ius esse*).
- 213, 19 *commodum ipsi* codd. praeter O (*ipsi commodum*).
- 215, 19 *ita istum* codd. praeter O (*istum ita*) : cp. 100, 3.
- 215, 33 *aliquanto ante quam* p et al. : *ante aliquanto ante quam* O. This may be another instance (cp. 343, 2) in which O is caught in the act of making an inversion. But it should be noted that *aliquanto* does not occur in Par. 7786, and is omitted also in the editio Romana : it may have been supplied in some ancient copy above the line, or in the margin. The vulgate gives *ante aliquanto quam*.
- 216, 21 *data esse Verri* cO : *Verri data esse* p rell. Here the Cluniacensis is reported by Fabricius: Zielinski, however, (p. 193) prefers the order in p.
- 216, 27 *bona privati* (*privata* k) p et rell. praeter O (*privata bona*).
- 216, 28 *ipsi illi* codd. praeter O (*illi ipsi*) : 424, 6.
- 216, 36 *rumore populi et clamore* p rell. praeter O' (*rumore et clamore populi*).
- 216, 37 *furto manifesto* codd. praeter O (*manif. fur.*).
- 217, 18 *tecum multum* p rell. praeter O (*multum tecum*).
- 217, 19 *una* codd. praeter O (*tecum una* : corr. m. 1 *una tecum*). If *tecum* had stood in the Cluniacensis, it would certainly have been reported.
- 218, 29 *quo accessisti quaeso*. I base this new reading on the tradition of the Cluniacensis reported by Nannius and Metellus, *quo accessisti quasi* : O perpetrates an inversion, *acc. quo quasi*. Lambinus conjectured *quo quaeso accessisti*, MS support for which is now forthcoming from Lg. 6 and r (*quo quasi accessisti*) : p omits *quo*, and so also q.
- 218, 30 *tecum istum* codd. praeter O (*istum tecum*).
- 219, 1 *Epicrates quidam* codd. praeter O (*quidam Epicrates* : 'pessime', Zielinski, p. 193).
- 219, 10 *hunc everti* V et rell. praeter O (*everti hunc*).
- 219, 20 *contemnere et neglegere coepit* V : *negl. et cont. coepit* p rell. : *negl. coepit et cont.* O.

- 219, 36 *ab se male acceptos* codd. praeter V (*male acceptos ab se*).  
Here V may be right : or *ab se* may be an adscript :  
it is omitted in the editio Romana.
- 220, 15 *re cognita* p rell. praeter O' (*cognita causa*).
- 221, 26 *existimatione eius* V rell. praeter O (*eius exist.*).
- 221, 27 *illud idem (item V)* VO : *idem illud* p rell.
- 222, 4 *esse videantur* V rell. praeter O (*videantur esse*) : 238,  
23 : 309, 7 : 442, 4.
- 222, 30 *semper usus est* Vpb : *semper* om. O' : *usus est semper* qr.
- 223, 10 *mecum decedere* VO : *dec. mecum* p rell.
- 223, 11 *oppida mihi* VO : *mihi oppida* p rell.
- 223, 15 *edidi nomina* VO : *nomina edidi* p rell.

In these three instances the authority of V must induce us to accept what might otherwise have been classed as inversions in O. They occur close together, and it is odd that they were not reported from the Cluniacensis : perhaps this codex showed the same order as p, but with transposition marks, which, while they escaped the notice of Nannius and the rest, were given effect to by the writer of O.

- 225, 9 *iudicium dimittitur* O pq (Zielinski) : *dimittitur iud.* rell.  
ed. Rom.
- 225, 20 *tamen in consilio* codd. praeter O' (*in consilio tamen*) :  
206, 27 : 301, 33.
- 225, 27 *est ventum* codd. praeter Lg. 6 et O (pr. *ventum est*,  
corr. m. 1).
- 226, 12 *adfuerant antea* codd. praeter O (*antea adfuerant*).
- 226, 36 *tantam non posse* codd. praeter O (*tantam posse non*) :  
*non posse tantam* ed. Rom.
- 227, 31 *ex hoc iudicio si* codd. praeter O (*si ex hoc iudicio*).
- 228, 1 *istum vobiscum* cO' : *vobiscum istum* p rell.
- 228, 14 *accipere ab reo* codd. praeter O (*ab reo accipere*).
- 228, 20 *pecunia accepta* codd. praeter O (*accepta pecunia*).
- 229, 3 *pecuniam ab accusatoribus dari* O (prob. Zielinski, p. 194) :  
*ab. acc. pec. dari* p rell.
- 229, 26 *attendite diligenter invenietis enim* cO : *attendite enim*  
*dil. inv.* p rell.
- 230, 13 *iste cupiditate* VO' : *cupid. iste* p rell.
- 233, 19 *de sella ac tribunali pronuntiat* codd. praeter O (*pron. de*  
*sella ac trib.*).
- 234, 9 *absens reus* p rell. praeter Oq (*reus absens.*).

- 234, 10 *nullum fieri* codd. praeter O (*fieri nullum*).  
 235, 32 *ita rem* Vq : *rem ita* Op ed. Rom. (100, 3).  
 235, 37 *Romae liceret* VO : *liceret Romae* p rell., ed. Rom.  
 236, 13 *se laqueos* VO : *laqueos se* p rell., ed. Rom.  
 236, 27 *cum haec ac . . . .* (sic desinens) V : *cum res esset acta*  
     p et pler. : *cum acta res* (om. *esset*) O. Here we  
     should probably read *cum haec acta res esset*.  
 237, 8 *tuae te tabulae* O. It seems best here to accept the  
     collocation in O. In p and Lgg. 6, 29 *te* is omitted.  
     The vulgate gives *te tuae tabulae*, though in the ed.  
     Rom. *te* was inserted before *possent*, which gives the  
     best clausula.  
 237, 10 *totum hoc* codd. praeter O (*hoc totum*).  
 238, 12 *Sthenio nemo* codd. praeter O (*nemo Sthenio*, ut videtur).  
 238, 23 *esse videatur* codd. praeter O (*videatur esse*) : 222, 4 :  
     309, 7.  
 239, 23 *tuo isto* πkO : *isto tuo* δ.  
 244, 28 *illum locum* codd. praeter V (*locum illum*).  
 245, 21 *scriptum ita* codd. praeter O et b (*ita scriptum*) : 100, 3.  
 245, 23 *inquit sunt* cO : *sunt inquit* p al. : *inquit* om b ed. Rom.  
 246, 16 *cum iste* cO : *iste cum* pb.  
 246, 27 *XXX diebus* codd. praeter O (*diebus XXX*).  
 247, 14 *domus tota* codd. praeter O (*tota domus*).  
 250, 6 *animo aequo* codd. praeter V (*equo animo*).  
 250, 33 *omnibus in* codd. praeter O (*in omnibus*).  
 251, 10 *est ista pecunia* VO' : *ista pec. est* p rell.  
 251, 13 *si hoc a vobis* codd. praeter V (*hoc si a vobis*) : *si a vobis*  
     *hoc* ed. Rom.  
 253, 32 *ita eos abs te* pb al., ed. Rom. : *eos ita abs te* vulg. Here  
     O first wrote *eos ita abs te*, then added transposition  
     marks to change the order to *ita eos abs te*; and then  
     the same hand deletes *ita*, and adds it after *te* = *eos*  
     *abs te ita*.  
 255, 21 *iudicium fieri* Vp rell. praeter O (*fieri iudicium*) : 475,  
     12 : 338, 23.  
 255, 35 *locis omnibus* VO p al. : *omnibus locis* c : *omnibus* b δ  
 256, 18 *publice laudarent* codd. praeter V (*laudarent publice*).  
 256, 23 *igitur est* Vp : *est igitur* Ob al.  
 256, 23 *tibi necessario* Vp rell. praeter O (*necessario tibi*).  
 266, 31 *parvis libellis* codd. praeter O (*libellis parvis*).  
 268, 21 *quis (qui) esset ubi esset* VcO : *ubi esset quis esset* p rell.

- 268, 36 *responde tu mihi nunc* O : *resp. mihi nunc tu* pb ed.  
 Rom. : *resp. nunc tu mihi* r : *tu* om. V.  
 269, 4 *ne hoc aut* VOcp : *hoc ne* (om. *aut*) b rell. praeter r (*ne aut hoc*).  
 269, 8 *primas litteras* codd. praeter V (*litteras primas*).  
 269, 20 *tum ita* p rell. praeter O (*ita tum*) : *ita* om. b.

## Book III.

- 271, 24 *confirmato consilio* codd. (including here Harl. 2682=H) praeter O (*consilio confirmato*). The motive of this inversion may have been an ill-judged attempt to produce a chiasmus between *consilio confirmato* and *ineunte aetate*. I take *confirmato* here as a dative (with *sibi*): cp. Cluent. § 13 *animum adulescentis nondum consilio ac ratione firmatum*.  
 271, 34 *ego hoc* HO : *hoc ego* p rell. Cp. l. 36 : 349. 37 : 496, 3.  
 272, 15 *istius unius* HcO (224, 6 : 278, 29) : *unius istius* p rell.  
 272, 16 *mihi iudices* Op et pler. : *iudices mihi* H<sup>1</sup> al. Cp. 146, 1.  
 274, 35 *vita victuque* p rell. : *victu vitaeque* O. The transposition in O receives no support from Cicero's usual practice : cp. *vitae atque victus* Verr. V § 187 : *vita atque victu* Brut. § 95 : *vita victuque* Legg. § 32 : *vita . . . victusque communis* Or. I § 58. It may be a learned reminiscence of Lucretius (*victum vitamque* V, 804, 1080, 1105).  
 275, 22 *duae sunt* codd. praeter O (*sunt duae*).  
 275, 29 *maiorum sapientiam* codd. praeter O (*sapientiam maiorum*).  
 277, 33 *Cum haec essent ita constituta* codd. praeter V (*ita essent*). Cp. 100, 3.  
 278, 20 *fingite vobis si potestis aliquem* V rell. praeter O (*fing. vobis aliquem si potestis*). It may be reported that p has *fingite si potestis vobis aliquem*, where the transposition marks give the generally received reading : 296, 24 : 324, 2.  
 279, 1 *in convivio saltare* codd. praeter O (*saltare in convivio* : prob. Zielinski, p. 195). Cp. *pro rege Deiot.*, § 26.

<sup>1</sup> In regard to the excerpts from the Verrines contained in Harl. 2682 (H) it will be noted that we have four readings at the opening of Book III, for two of which H is in agreement with O. At 379, 10 and 389, 19 we have already found H supporting R.

- 279, 9 *iudices audite* V rell. praeter O (*audite iudices*). Cp. 146, 1.
- 279, 20 *veri enim simile* Vc O : *veri simile enim* p rell. Cp. 410, 14.
- 279, 37 *rerum rusticarum* V rell. praeter O (*rusticarum rerum*).
- 280, 11 *sit licitus* Vq (prob. Zielinski, l. c.) : *licitus sit* p rell.
- 280, 28 *ista cohors* codd. praeter V (*cohors ista*).
- 280, 32 *aiebat omnis esse* V : *esse aiebat omnes* c and Par. 4588 : *esse aiebat omnes esse* O (another attempted inversion : cp. 343, 2) : *omnes dicebat esse* p al.
- 281, 3 *putatis decumanum* V rell. praeter O (*decumanum putatis*).
- 281, 15 *sibi quam* V rell. praeter O (*quam sibi*).
- 282, 6 *viri optimi* codd. praeter O (*optimi viri*, ut videtur).
- 282, 13 *daturum in octuplum* codd. praeter O (*in octuplum daturum*).
- 282, 15 *honestissimorumque hominum* cO : *hominumque honest.* p rell.
- 282, 21 *re quidem vera* codd. praeter O (*re vera quidem*).
- 282, 24 *ullius mentionem iudicii* O p al. (prob. Zielinski) : *ullius iud. ment.* rell.
- 282, 37 *est reliqui* c rell. praeter O (*reliqui est*).
- 284, 33 *esse posset* p rell. praeter O (*possit esse*). Cp. 335, 20.
- 285, 3 *Tantum Apronium* codd. praeter O (*Apronium tantum*).
- 285, 25 *decumas vendidisti* cO (prob. Zielinski) : *vend. dec.* Vp rell.
- 285, 30 *aude te dicere* codd. praeter V (*dicere aude te*).
- 285, 34 *Magna est enim laus* codd. praeter p (*magna enim est laus*), and q (*magna enim laus est*) Here, however, V is reported as omitting *enim*, which may be an adscript. Cp. 410, 14.
- 286, 9 *pro his decumis pecunia* VO : *pec. pro his decumis* p rell.
- 286, 18 *fuit habenda* VO : *habenda fuit* p rell.
- 287, 3 *Siciliae civitates* codd. praeter V (*civit. Sicil.*).
- 287, 9 *mittat litteras* codd. praeter V (*litteras mittat*).
- 287, 34 *augendi criminis* VO : *crim. aug.* p rell.
- 287, 35 *ipse accepi* VO : *accepi ipse* p rell.
- 288, 8 *ex maxima parte ut* V rell. praeter O (*ut ex max. parte*).
- 288, 26 *hoc tibi* codd. praeter O (*tibi hoc*). Cp. 332, 19.
- 288, 28 *rei frumentariae* codd. praeter O (*frum. rei*).
- 289, 17 *esse vestrum* codd. praeter O (*vestrum esse*).

- 289, 21 *aratorum omnes* codd. praeter O (*omnes aratorum*).  
 289, 25 *fuisse dico* cO : *dico fuisse* rell.  
 289, 26 *locatione illa* codd. praeter O (*illa locatione*). Surely if the order given in O had stood in the Cluniacensis, it would have been reported by the collator who noticed *fuisse dico* in the line above.  
 289, 32 *iam addictis* codd. praeter O (*addictis iam*).  
 290, 33 *quod nullam ad aliam rem*. This is the right reading, and it is only cited for the purpose of reporting that O inverts *ad nullam*, and in so doing omits *quod*. Cp. 328, 19.  
 290, 35 *vellet aequo iudicio* codd. praeter V (*aequo vellet iud.*).  
 291, 6 *eius omnis* V rell. praeter O (*omnis eius*).  
 291, 19 *se non arasse* Vc O : *non arasse se* p al.  
 291, 20 *eius esse* V rell. praeter O (*esse eius*).  
 291, 26 *se accepturum* VO : *accept. se* p rell.  
 292, 31 *eorum iniurias* codd. praeter V (*iniurias eorum*).  
 293, 14 *amplius a me* VO : *a me amplius* p rell.  
 293, 27 *iudices dicam* V rell. praeter O (*dicam iudices*). Cp. 146, 1.  
 294, 30 *filius eius* codd. praeter O (*eius filius*).  
 294, 34 *iniuriis contumeliisque* codd. praeter O (*contumeliis iniuriisque*). Cp. 307, 30.  
 295, 8 *antea furta* codd. praeter O (*furta antea*).  
 295, 28 *tanto periculo tuo* codd. praeter O (*tanto tuo peric.*).  
 295, 32 *tuarum fortunarum* p rell. Here O at first wrote *fortunarum tuarum*, but changed to the usual reading cp. 101, 1.  
 296, 1 *pulsari alios autem verberari*. This is the reading of all the codd. except O, which makes (*more suo*) the inversion *autem alios*. The passage may be very simply emended *Videtis pendere alios ex arbore pulsari alios, alios autem verberari*.  
 296, 19 Most codd., agreeing with p, give *eo cum vi ac minis*, which would make a sentence like that at 214, 23 (*quod . . . cum multis lacrimis cum oraret*) : O has the significant inversion *vi ac minis eo*, and so Lambinus in the margin of the edition of 1584. But V gives *eo et cum agminis*, founding on which I propose to read *eo et vi ac minis* (Class. Rev. XVIII, p. 26).

- 296, 24 *satis fortes* V : *et fortes satis* p rell. Here, however, p has transposition marks, as at 278, 20. The fact that all the codd., except V, go on with *et satis plane*, instead of *et plane*, suggests that the true reading is *homines satis fortes et plane frugi*, which some copyist sought to change to *hom. et fortes satis et satis*, etc.
- 296, 28 *magno praesertim* codd. praeter O (*praes. magno*).
- 297, 23 *sibi suas* V rell. praeter O (*suas sibi*) : 303, 14 : 181, 31.
- 297, 26 *dicat licet* V rell. praeter O (*licet dicat*).
- 297, 36 *dedisset* (edid. O) *arator* VO : *arator dedisset* rell.
- 298, 22 *diligentissime pretia* codd. praeter O (*pretia dilig.*).
- 298, 32 *Quid est hoc* codd. praeter O (*Quid hoc est*) : 424, 3 : 281, 19.
- 300, 15 *istius item* V rell. : *item istius* cO.
- 300, 19 *ei lucri dare* V rell. praeter O (*lucri dare ei*).
- 300, 31 *Apronium imitari* V rell. praeter O (*imitari Apronium*).  
Cp. 357, 9 where all the codd. have *imitari Antonium*, except O, which first gives *Anthonium imitari* and then restores the usual order of the words. Considerations of rhythm must have been the motive in both cases.
- 301, 33 *tamen illi* V rell. praeter O (*illi tamen*) : 206, 27.
- 302, 14 *pecunias publice* O : *publice pecunias* rell.
- 302, 22 *iudices gemitum* codd. praeter O (*gemitum iudices*) : 146, 1.
- 303, 3 *senatus consultis* codd. praeter O (*consultis senatus*).
- 303, 14 *tibi tuam* codd. praeter O (*tuam tibi*) : 297, 23.
- 304, 3 *totum integrum* VO : *integrum totum* p rell.
- 304, 12 *hic interpres* VO : *interpres hic* p rell.
- 305, 4 *omnino frumenti* VO : *frum. omnino* p rell.
- 307, 11 *ex tabulis ipsius* codd. praeter O (*ex ipsius tabulis*).
- 307, 30 *iniurias libidinesque* codd. praeter O (*libidines iniuriasque*). Cp. 294, 34.
- 308, 19 *haberet arationes* codd. praeter O (*arationes haberet*).
- 309, 7 *praeda esse videatur* codd. praeter O (*esse videatur praeda*) : 222, 4. Here Zielinski (p. 195) would delete *praeda*. But the transposition is obviously one of the 'scholarly' corrections made by the copyist of O: see p. 151, below.
- 309, 20 *non in quo* O : *in quo non* p rell.
- 310, 10 *mihi esse iam* codd. praeter O (*iam mihi esse*) : 203, 13.

- 311, 3 *nullum in Sicilia* codd. praeter O (*in Sicilia nullum*).  
 311, 10 *in foro sibi medio* codd. praeter O (*in medio foro sibi*).  
 311, 21 *agri . . . . anni* codd. praeter O (*anni . . . . agri*).  
 312, 4 *in faciendis furtis fuisse* codd. praeter O (*in faciundis fuisse furtis*).  
 312, 22 *graviores certioresque* codd. praeter O (*gravioresque*).  
 This omission ex homoeoteleuto in O (cp. 152) has led editors wrongly to follow Halm in reading *certiores gravioresque*.  
 312, 31 *me multum* codd. praeter O (*multum me*).  
 313, 9 *Leontina civitas me* codd. praeter O (*me Leont. civ.*)  
 313, 32 *quantum lucri* cO : *lucri quantum* p rell.  
 313, 34 *conficere tabulas se negaret* codd. praeter O (*conf. se tab. neg.*) If this reading of O had stood in C, it could hardly have escaped the notice of the collator who reported *quantum lucri*, two lines above. Cp. 452, 35 (*esse*—for *sese*—*vidisse diceret* RS : *vidisse se diceret* p al.)  
 314, 5 *aratores omnes* codd. praeter O (*omnes aratores*).  
 316, 4 *decumas agri Leontini* codd. praeter O (*agri Leont. dec.*).  
 316, 9 *decumae saepe* codd. praeter O (*saepe decumae*).  
 316, 30 *erat aliquid* codd. praeter O (*aliquid erat*).  
 317, 1 HS *fortasse D milia* codd. praeter O (*HS D milia fortasse*).  
 317, 2 *ullo iure* codd. praeter O (*iure ullo*).  
 317, 14 *tanto plus mercedis* p al. : *tanto sibi plus merc.* codd. pler. : *tanto plus sibi merc.* O.  
 317, 26 *secum actum esse pessime* codd. praeter O (*secum esse actum pessime*). As a matter of fact, O here has *pactum* : it may almost seem as if the writer had thought of inverting *pessime actum*, but stopped short in the process.  
 318, 16 *ex publicis litteris* codd. praeter O (*ex litteris publicis*) Cp. 362, 1.  
 319, 32 *a me opera* cO : *opera a me* p rell.  
 319, 35 *provinciam miseram perditamque* codd. praeter O (*perditamque prov. mis.*).  
 321, 2 *de re eadem* codd. praeter O (*eadem de re*).  
 322, 13 *incredibile dictu est* codd. praeter O (*incred. est dictu*).  
 322, 32 *nervis mihi* V rell. praeter O (*mihi nervis*).  
 323, 32 *eorum te* codd. praeter O (*te eorum*).

- 325, 14 *hoc se audisse(t) p : audisse se (om. hoc) O*. Cp. on 313, 34.  
 326, 1 *etiam illum* codd. praeter O (*illum etiam*) : 328, 16.  
 326, 11 *absolvi se V : se absolvi Op* rell.  
 326, 17 *statuas idoneum iudicem V* rell. praeter O (*statuas alium iudicem idoneum*). The reading of O here I take to be a marginal variant, possibly in the Cluni codex, "al. *iudicem idoneum*."  
 328, 16 *etiam aliquis* codd. praeter O (*aliquis etiam*) : 326, 1.  
 328, 19 *quid est hoc* codd. praeter O (*est hoc quod*).  
 328, 22 *magis hoc vobis* codd. praeter O (*vobis magis hoc*).  
 328, 37 *ita res . . . . allata ut p : ita ante allata O*, post *allata* Lamb. in mg. 1584. Cp. 100, 3.  
 329, 11 *potius semper* codd. praeter O (*semper potius*) : 106, 29.  
 329, 32 *hoc ut opinor* codd. praeter O (*ut opinor hoc*).  
 329, 36 *te vendere . . . . addicere* codd. praeter O (*vendere . . . . te addicere*).  
 330, 11 *negare omnia* codd. praeter O (*omnia negare*).  
 330, 36 *defensio est* codd. praeter O (*est defensio*). 428, 6.  
 331, 5 *ideo te* codd. praeter O (*te ideo*).  
 331, 15 *amplius vultis V* (prob. Zielinski) : *vultis amplius O* p rell.  
 332, 19 *sibi hoc* codd. praeter V (*hoc sibi*) : 288, 26 : 344, 17.  
 332, 20 *hoc esse V : esse hoc p al. : hoc. om. O*.  
 333, 20 *pecunia corrumpi V* rell. praeter O (*corrumpi pecunia*).  
 333, 22 *coniectura domestica V* rell. praeter O (*dom. coniect.* : prob. Zielinski, p. 195).  
 333, 37 *non hoc crimen nos in te* codd. praeter V (*hoc crimen in te nos non*).  
 334, 5 *in decumis socium fuisse V* rell. praeter O (*sotium in dec. fuisse*).  
 334, 13 *iudices, vobis, epistulam V : iud. epist. vobis p* rell. praeter O (*vobis iud. epist.*) : 146, 1.  
 334, 34 *prudens ac bonus p et pler. (335, 12) : bonus ac prudens (prudens) O al.*  
 335, 20 *esse possent* codd. praeter O (*possent esse*). Cp. 284, 33 : *videantur esse*, 222, 4.  
 335, 24 *abs te res publica muneris* codd. praeter O (*res pub. abs te muneris*).  
 336, 2 *deesse nocenti p* rell. praeter qr : these two codd., from a wish to create a chiasmus, invert *nocenti deesse*.

- 336, 7 *emere in Sicilia* codd. praeter O (*in Sicilia emere*).
- 337, 7 *cum posita esset pecunia* cO : *eam cum posita esset* p rell.
- 337, 16 *ad emendum frumentum*, etc. This passage is cited only to record an inversion in O, which omits *frumentum* after *emendum*, and then goes on "*fuert frumentum ne tibi*".
- 337, 34 *in Siciliam litteras* codd. praeter O (*litteras in Siciliam*).
- 338, 5 *se tibi ait* codd. praeter O (*ait se tibi*).
- 338, 7 *pecuniam populo* p O : *pop. pec.* al.
- 338, 14 *frater uxoris* codd. praeter O (*uxoris frater*).
- 338, 15 *impudentissimum tuum* Op : *tuum impud.* al.
- 338, 23 *posse fieri* Vp rell. praeter O (*fieri posse*) : 475, 12.
- 338, 24 *usura publicanos* VO : *publ. us.* p rell.
- 338, 35 *te tuam pecuniam* Vp rell. : *te pecuniam tuam* cO.
- 339, 16 *milia tritici* V : *tritici milia* rell.
- 339, 29 *frumenti esset* codd. praeter V (*esset frumenti*).
- 339, 33 *Volcatio, Timarchidi, scribae* codd. praeter V (*Timarchidi et Volc. scribae*).
- 340, 16 *Thermitanum, Cephaloeditanum* codd. praeter V (*Ceph., Therm.*).
- 341, 35 *quidem tibi* codd. praeter O (*tibi quidem*).
- 341, 37 *pretio cum civitatibus* V rell. praeter O (*cum civit. pretio*).
- 342, 3 *haec ad te* V rell. praeter O (*ad te haec*).
- 342, 26 *paucis post mensibus et exercitum et consulem spoliatum* codd. praeter O (*mensibus post paucis et cons. et exerc. spol.*).
- 342, 37 *ut audaciae* codd. praeter O (*audaciae ut*).
- 343, 2 *mihi videtur* codd. praeter O (*videtur mihi videtur*).  
This I take to be an instance of arbitrary transposition on the part of O, detected this time in the process.
- 343, 20 *non omne* codd. praeter O (*omne non*).
- 343, 36 *forte est* codd. praeter O (*est forte*).
- 344, 1 *inquam da mihi* codd. praeter O (*mihi da inquam*).
- 344, 17 *tibi hoc* codd. praeter O (*hoc tibi*) : 332, 19.
- 344, 24 *ita est* codd. praeter O (*est ita fort. recte*) : 100, 3.
- 344, 25 *mercede populi* codd. praeter O (*pop. merc.*).
- 344, 29 *sit aut ullo iure* V rell. praeter O (*aut ullo iure sit*).  
Zielinski (p. 196) prefers the reading of V.
- 345, 4 *mihi totum* VO : *totum mihi* p al.
- 345, 7 *ac (et O) non potius mulio* cO : *non mulio plus (om.ac)* V.

- 345, 19 *novam rem* V rell. praeter O (*rem novam*). A reference to the context will show how arbitrary and impossible this transposition is.
- 345, 26 *esse moleste ferunt* codd. praeter V (*moleste ferunt esse*).
- 345, 27 *multos non* V rell. praeter O (*non multos*).
- 345, 29 *pretio licet* VO : *licet pretio* p rell.
- 345, 32 *quemquam ferre* VO : *ferre quemquam* p rell.
- 346, 37 *praefatio tuae donationis* codd. praeter O (*tua praef. don.*).
- 347, 7 *quoniam te* codd. praeter O (*te quoniam re*).
- 347, 21 *quaternis* HS codd. praeter O (-N-S- IIII) : 348, 35.
- 347, 24 *denariis ternis* codd. praeter O (*ternis denariis*).
- 347, 36 *ternos ab aratoribus denarios* codd. praeter O (*den. ternos ab arat.*).
- 348, 4 *civilatum et aratorum* p al. : *arat. et (atque) civit.* pler. codd.
- 348, 18 *ad portandum loca* O : *loca ad portandum* p al. Here *ad portandum* may be a gloss on *difficillima*.
- 348, 29 *nunc abs te* codd. praeter V (*abs te nunc*).
- 348, 35 *ternos denarios* V : *ternos* (om. *denarios*) pr : *denarios iii* O.
- 349, 22 *si vis Hortensi docere* VcO : *si quid Hort. docere vis* p dett.
- 349, 24 *esse factum* V rell. praeter O (*factum esse*).
- 349, 37 *ego hoc* codd. praeter O (*hoc ego*) : 271, 34.
- 350, 33 *modium denario* codd. praeter O (*denario modium*).
- 351, 4 *simul iudices* codd. praeter O (*iudices simul*).
- 351, 14 *denarios a te dari* p al. : *denarios dari* rell. praeter O (*dari denarios*).
- 352, 5 *illi quoque homines sunt* V : *illi homines quoque sunt* O : *illi quoque sunt homines* p. rell. Cp. 261, 5.
- 352, 19 *gratis dare* codd. praeter V (*dare gratis*). Zielinski writes *gratiis* (p. 196).
- 352, 31 *ad aequitatem condicionis* cO : *aequitate condicionis* V : *ad aequitatis condicionem* p rell.
- 353, 13 *modiis tritici* cO : M. TRIT. V : *trit. mod.* p rell.
- 353, 14 *est pecunia* V : *pecunia est* p rell. (om. O).
- 354, 32 *liberi populi* V rell. praeter O (*populi liberi*).
- 355, 11 *haec a me opera* V rell. praeter O (*haec opera a me*—Zielinski p. 196).
- 355, 18 *in causa tanta* V rell. praeter O (*in antea causa*).

- 355, 25 *fecisse idem* V rell. praeter O (*idem fecisse*).  
 355, 25 *res mihi* codd. praeter V (*mihi res*).  
 356, 26 *ista ipsa* codd. praeter O (*ipsa ista*). Here O at first wrote *ista ipsa*, and afterwards inverted: 262, 9: 371, 2: 494, 23: 499, 1. Cp. on 109, 5.  
 357, 9 *Antonium imitari* V rell. praeter O (*imitari Antonium*). Here O at first wrote *Anthonium imitari*, and then changed the order: 301, 31.  
 357, 13 *contra sociorum salutem* V rell. praeter O (*soc. contra sal.*).  
 357, 15 *eius iniuriis* V rell. praeter O (*iniuriis eius*).  
 357, 17 *eius omnia facta* V rell. praeter O (*omnia eius facta*).  
 357, 35 *iii denariis* codd. praeter O (*denariis iii*): 359, 27.  
 359, 1 *defensionem vestram* codd. praeter O (*vestr. def.*).  
 359, 12 *iudices sitis* codd. praeter O (*sitis iudices*).  
 359, 25 *sitis hominibus . . . daturi* codd. praeter O (*istis hominibus . . . daturi sitis*).  
 359, 27 *ternos denarios* codd. praeter O (*denarios ternos*): 357, 35.  
 360, 9 *qui idem fecerint* V rell. praeter O (*idem qui fecerint*).  
 361, 20 *vos id credidissetis* V rell. praeter p (*id vos credidisse*).  
 362, 1 *publicis litteris* V rell. praeter O (*litteris publicis*): 318, 16.  
 362, 9 *tota re* codd. praeter O (*re tota*).  
 362, 32 *res rusticae eius modi sunt* codd. praeter O (*res huius modi rusticae sunt*).

After this lengthy enumeration, we must endeavor to arrive at some general conclusions for the Second and Third Books, so far as these transposition variants are concerned. The foregoing lists contain 114 instances for Book II, and 208 for Book III, making 322 in all. It will be noted that Book III has been more tampered with than Book II: also that O becomes less reliable towards the end. A review of what may be considered more or less crucial cases reveals the fact that the places in which the authority of O must be allowed to prevail are only about half as numerous as those in which it must be rejected. This is a curious reversal of the judgment which might have been expected in regard to a codex which stands in so near a relation to the Cluniacensis. But on the whole it appears probable that the order of words as now found in O was *not* as a rule, and especially in Book III, the order in which they were originally placed by Cicero.

And yet the extant fragments of the Cluniacensis may be relied on to show that, for these passages, O is on the whole, and with exceptions, a faithful reproduction of C.

With regard to the much larger portions of Books II-III which are no longer extant in C, it is certainly a remarkable phenomenon that so few of the transpositions in O are cited by Nannius, Metellus and Fabricius as having been found in C before its mutilation. In the long lists just given, the formula cO occurs only in the following places: 216, 21: 228, 1: 229, 26: 245, 23: 246, 16: 268, 21: 269, 4: 272, 15: 279, 20: 282, 15: 285, 25: 289, 25: 291, 19: 297, 13: 300, 15: 313, 32: 328, 37: 337, 7: 349, 22: 352, 31: 353, 13. If all the cases of discrepant order now found in O had occurred in C, how does it happen that most of them escaped the diligence of the various collators through whose hands this notable codex is now known to have passed?

On the whole it seems most probable that the majority of inversions in O were made by the copyist of that codex. This view may account for the numerous cases in which, after changing the order, the first hand in O corrects his own work, and restores the generally received tradition. He made more or less arbitrary changes as he went along, which he afterwards wished to recall, either in the light of what he had before him, or on a comparison of the version he had made with some member of the family of the MSS at the head of which stands Par. 7776 (p).<sup>1</sup> The fashion of transposing may have been partly set by the writer of the Cluniacensis: there may even have been transposition marks in the lost portions of that codex to which effect was given by the copyist of O. In any case, it must be made plain that O is an unsafe guide to follow, at least as regards the order of words, in disputed places.

In the first place reference must be made to certain passages in which O is convicted of deliberately changing the order as we

<sup>1</sup> A discrepancy such as at p. 334, 7 (*volunt* Vcp: *volent* Op<sup>2</sup>) seems to show that what the writer of O had before him, in addition to the Cluni codex, was a MS of the same class as that which furnished the second hand (13th cent.) in p with his additions to and improvements on his original. This hand in p (=p<sup>2</sup>) is of the 13th cent., and carefully supplies above the line or in the margin words which had been omitted by the writer of p. Such omissions are especially frequent in the last books. The source of p<sup>2</sup> must have been one of the early dett.: cp. 383, 7 where it gives *avarissimum* instead of *cupidissimum*.

still have it in the Cluni codex. These are 203, 16: 209, 5: 240, 24: 264, 18: 259, 22. It will be obvious that what has happened five times in the comparatively few pages for which it is still possible to compare C with O may very well have happened quite as frequently in the other parts of Books II-III.

Next we must note the following places in which O departs from the order of words as reported by the collators of the Cluniacensis: 218, 29: 253, 32: 255, 35: 280, 32: 282, 37. This is an additional proof of the thesis that O cannot be accepted as giving, in all respects, a faithful reproduction of C.

Again, we have internal evidence, in several passages, that the copyist of O either deliberately sought to change the sequence, or else carelessly allowed a displacement to occur in his text. (Cp. Am. J. Ph. XXVI, p. 423 note). Reference should be made, in the foregoing lists, to 215, 33: 253, 32: 280, 32: 290, 33: 295, 32: 303, 3: 317, 26: 319, 35: 337, 16: 341, 35: 343, 2: 355, 18, 25: 356, 26: 357, 13: 362, 32. To these instances may be added 244, 6, where O first writes *de senatu Scipionis leges coop-tando*, and then corrects the wrong order by transposition marks: 283, 30 where for *et quaestuosissimum* O wanted to write *quaestuosissimumque*, but left his text standing *et quaestuosissimumque*: 344, 15 where O at first gives *sed quasi necesse esset plane*, and then corrects: 345, 5 where we have a curious instance of careless copying and inversion at the same time,—*sullū quā cogitassent et hoc a me postulassent* for *si illi umquam hoc a me postulassent, si umquam omnino cogitassent*: 352, 23 where for *qui ad* O writes *atque*.

In the following places, the authority of O is obviously not to be accepted, in regard to the order of words, as against V and the rest: 278, 20: 279, 9, 37: 281, 3, 15: 288, 8: 296, 28: 322, 32: 342, 3: 345, 27: 349, 24: 357, 9.

On the other hand, the fact must be recalled that there are several cases where—as may be seen from my previous paper (Vol. XXVI, p. 409)—V supports the readings of O, e. g., 286, 9, 18: 287, 34, 35.

As in the earlier portions of the Verrines (which have been dealt with along with IV-V), so also in Books II-III there is a considerable number of instances where transposition has resulted from the omission and subsequent restoration of a word. The following passages may be studied as illustrations: 219, 36: 222, 30: 237, 8: 240, 36: 241, 9: 245, 23: 268, 36: 285, 34: 317, 14:

332, 20: 334, 13: 352, 5. At 340, 34 for *ex tabulis locupletissimorum aratorum* p carelessly wrote *ex tabulis locupletorum*: the second hand restored *aratorum*, and gave rise to the variant *aratorum locupletissimorum*. At 362, 4  $\pi$ k agree in reading *in cellam ei sumere*: *ei* is omitted by VO, and in the dett. it is found before, instead of after, *in cellam*.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL,  
March, 1907.

W. PETERSON.

## II.—THE UNREAL CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN CICERO.

SECOND PAPER.

### III. THE FORM SI ESSET-FUISSET.

Of the four possible combinations of *esset* and *fuisset*, the unreal conditional sentence naturally chooses least often the form *si esset—fuisset*. Indeed, at first sight, this combination might seem an illogical one, whereas the reverse arrangement (*si fuisset—esset*) at once commends itself as eminently reasonable, its obvious function being to inform the hearer that, had the *past* been different, the *present* would not be as it is. However, of the 131 examples<sup>1</sup> of the form *si esset—fuisset* found in the works of Cicero, more than one-half yield to very simple treatment.

#### 1. *The normal use.*

In Verr. ii. 2. 52. 130:

Hoc si Romae fieri *posset*, certe aliqua ratione *expugnasset* iste, ut dies xxxv inter binos ludos tollerentur, per quos solos iudicium fieri *posset*.

In this sentence the condition *Hoc si Romae fieri posset* may be said to express a general unreality—just as the corresponding reality would call for expression in a phrase partaking of the nature of a general truth ("This is not possible at Rome"). That the chosen form of a general unreality should be *si esset* is quite as natural as that a general truth should find expression in the present indicative. The sentence in question therefore is strictly logical; for a general unreality does not swerve from the form *si esset* because its particular application is past, any more than a truth of general application swerves from the use of the present indicative under the same circumstances; e. g.,

<sup>1</sup> Such numbers as are given throughout this paper in general exclude cases in which the apodosis is a dependent clause introduced by *ut* or the like. Such dependence seems to be a disturbing factor as regards the tense of the *si*-clause.

"He *was* fined, because that *is* the law covering such cases."<sup>1</sup>

Such a sentence is of course perfectly normal, though the cause is expressed in the present tense and the effect in a past.

Other cases of the form *si esset—fuisset* are to be explained in the same way, though the *si*-clause is of far less general application; e. g.,

ad Fam. vii. 16. 2:

Ego si foris *cenitarem*, Cn. Octavio, familiari tuo, non *defuissem*.

Here the condition refers to a habit into which Cicero has fallen—the fact that he is not dining out much has kept him from accepting the invitation of Octavius. In the following case the pluperfect of the apodosis is worthy of study:

ad Att. vii. 13a. 3:

Si *scriberem* ipse, longior epistula *fuisset*; sed dictavi propter lippitudinem.

In this sentence *fuisset* seems to express an unreality of the perfect definite type—the letter would have been (and would now be) longer. The pluperfect so used is a very natural complement for the form *si esset* employed in however narrow a sense.

These three examples may serve to illustrate what is meant by "normal use"—so designated because a satisfactory explanation of the form *si esset—fuisset* is here forthcoming without putting upon the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive any other interpretation than those they commonly bear in Cicero when in other combinations (e. g., *si esset—esset* and *si fuisset—fuisset*). With the three examples cited, 59 other cases of the form *si esset—fuisset* may be included under this heading. It will suffice to give the references merely; Auct. ad Her. iv. 11. 16, de Orat. i. 10. 41, i. 52. 225, ii. 56. 227–28, Brut. 34. 131, Orat. 29. 103, p. Quinct. 14. 46, 16. 53, p. Sex. Rosc. 26. 72, in Verr. i. 2. 5, ii. 1. 44. 113, ii. 1. 53. 139, ii. 2. 1. 3, ii. 2. 24. 58, ii. 2. 40. 99, ii. 3. 92. 215, p. Font. 18. 40, in Cat. i. 12. 29, ii. 2. 3, p. Mur. 4. 8, 23. 46, p. Sulla 12. 35, de Dom. 51. 132, de Har. Resp. 24. 52, p. Balb. 14. 32 (*sicubi*), p. Planc. 17. 43, p. Mil. 29. 79, p. Deio. 9. 25, Phil. ii. 7. 17, ii. 18. 46, ii. 28. 70, v. 1. 1, xiii. 13. 28, ad Fam. iii. 10. 6, v. 20. 2, vi. 10. 4, viii. 5. 3 (Caelius), viii. 6. 4 (Caelius), viii. 10. 1 (Caelius), viii. 16. 4 (Caelius), viii. 17. 2 (Caelius), xi. 24. 1, xii. 22a. 4, xii. 30. 6, xiii. 57. 1, ad Q. Fr. i. 2. 4. 13, ad Att.

<sup>1</sup> The philosophical imperfect in Greek would be an exception to this rule.

iii. 15. 4,<sup>1</sup> vii. 2. 6, viii. 5. 3, ix. 10. 2, x. 8. A. 1 (Antonius), x. 12a. 2, xi. 13. 2, xii. 16, xiii. 47, ad. M. Brut. i. 17. 6 (Brutus), de Fin. ii. 10. 30, Cato M. 3. 8, Facete Dict. G. b. 3.

## 2. The indirect inferential use.

The nature of the indirect inferential use of the unreal conditional sentence in general has already been explained in detail—the apodosis calls attention to a manifest fact, and the protasis impresses the inference to be drawn from it. The indirect inferential use of all forms of the unreal conditional sentence is fairly frequent; e. g., among cases of the forms *si esset—esset* and *si fuisset—fuisset* about one in twelve is an example of that use. With the standard proportion thus established by the forms which occur with the greatest frequency, it is astonishing to find that *si esset—fuisset*, with its small total of 131 cases, is used 50 times as the expression of the indirect inferential. So surprising a phenomenon deserves the most careful scrutiny, and I give the material in full. The 50 examples fall into two well defined groups.

### A. The normal indirect inferential.

This group is thus designated because, so far as tense use is concerned, the 26 examples which it comprises may be explained on the same basis as the normal cases under the preceding heading; e. g.,

de Invent. i. 48. 90:

Si causam veram non *haberet*, vobis se, iudices, non *commisisset*. In this sentence *si haberet* refers to an unreality of a somewhat general character—the guilt of the prisoner at the bar. In this respect the case is like those of the form *si esset—fuisset* already discussed; but in addition it is used to suggest an argument—the client was willing to stand trial; therefore his case is a good one. The other like examples follow;

p. Rab. Perd. 5. 14:

At vero, si actio ista popularis *esset* et si ullam partem aequitatis *haberet* aut iuris, C. Gracchus eam *reliquisset*?

<sup>1</sup> A curious case in which the pluperfect reenforces the imperfect. The general sense of the passage is so vague that Watson doubts the soundness of the text.

p. Mur. 8. 17:

Quodsi id crimen homini novo esse *deberet*, profecto mihi neque inimici neque invidi *defuissent*.

p. Flacc. 22. 52:

Nonne *esset puditum*, si hanc causam *agerent* severe, non modo legatum, sed Trallianum omnino dici Maeandrium?

p. Cael. 29. 69:

quod profecto numquam hominum sermo atque opinio *comprobasset*, nisi omnia, quae cum turpitudine aliqua dicerentur, in istam quadrare apte *viderentur*.

in Pis. 21. 50:

Hic si mentis *esset* suae, nisi poenas patriae . . . furore atque insania *penderet*, *ausus esset* (provinciam . . . sibi adsciscere)?

Phil. ii. 3. 5:

Quod si *esset* beneficium, numquam, qui illum interfecerunt, a quo erant conservati, . . . . . tantam *essent* gloriam *consecuti*.

Phil. vi. 3. 6:

Non is est Antonius; nam, si *esset*, non *commisisset*, ut ei senatus tamquam Hannibali . . . denuntiaret, ne . . . . .

ad Att. ii. 17. 1:

numquam huc *venissent*, nisi ad alias res pestiferas aditus sibi *compararent*.

ad Att. iii. 25:

neque enim . . . . si ulla spes salutis nostrae *subesset*, tu pro tuo amore in me hoc tempore *discessisses*.

ad Att. xi. 14. 2:

a quibus, si quid *esset* laetius, certior *factus essem*, tecum etiam *essent locuti*.

ad Att. xii. 37. 2:

nisi magnae curae tibi *esset*, . . . . . numquam ea res tibi tam belle in mentem venire *potuisset*.

Tusc. Disp. i. 22. 52:

Hunc igitur nosse nisi divinum *esset*, non *esset* hoc acrioris cuiusdam animi praeceptum *tributum* deo.

Tusc. Disp. i. 37. 89:

Quae (sc. mors) quidem, si *timeretur*, non L. Brutus . . . in proelio *concidisset* . . . . ., non . . . *obiecissent*, non . . . . *vidisset*.

Tusc. Disp. iii. 8. 16:

Quae (sc. frugalitas) nisi tanta *esset*, et si in iis angustiis, quibus

plerique putant, *teneretur*, numquam *esset* L. Pisonis cognomen tanto opere *laudatum*.

Tusc. Disp. iv. 16. 36:

Quodnisi eo nomine virtutes *containerentur*, numquam ita *per-  
volgatum esset* . . . . . "hominem frugi omnia recte facere."

Tusc. Disp. v. 39. 115:

aut, ni ita se res *haberet*, Anaxagoras aut hic ipse Democritus agros et patrimonia sua *reliquissent*, . . . . *dedissent*?

de Nat. D. i. 9. 22:

Quae ista potest esse oblectatio deo? quae si *esset*, non ea tam diu carere *potuisset*.

de Nat. D. i. 11. 28:

quo modo porro deus iste, si nihil *esset* nisi animus, aut *infixus* aut *infusus esset* in mundo?

de Nat. D. ii. 2. 4:

Quod ni ita *esset*, qui *potuisset* adsensu omnium dicere Ennius . . . .?

de Nat. D. ii. 2. 5:

Quod nisi cognitum . . . animis *haberemus*, non tam stabilis opinio . . . inveterari *potuisset*.

de Nat. D. ii. 3. 7:

quos tamen augures ne ipsae quidem fabulae *adscivissent*, si res omnino *repudiaret*.

de Nat. D. iii. 31. 76:

Quis enim te *adhibuisset*, dixerit quispiam, si ista non *essent*?

de Div. i. 31. 65:

Neque enim illud verbum temere consuetudo *adprobavisset*, si ea res nulla *esset* omnino.

de Off. iii. 29. 108:

Quod ni ita *esset*, numquam claros viros senatus vinctos hostibus *dedisset*.

Cato M. 6. 19:

Quae nisi *essent* in senibus, non summum consilium maiores nostri *appellassent* senatum.

Since these 26 cases of normal indirect inferential use yield, so far as tense is concerned, to the same treatment accorded the 62 cases of normal use under the preceding heading, the only question that remains to be solved is why, in a total of 88 cases,

there should be 26 examples of indirect inferential use—the standard proportion being about one in twelve. I am inclined to think that the frequency may be simply and satisfactorily explained by the fact that *si esset—fuisset*, without straining the normal sense of its tenses, is particularly fitted to be the expression of an argument in favor of a truth of general application; for the fact from which such truth is inferred often lies in the past; e. g., (de Off. iii. 29. 108) the indirect inferential suggests, as proof that even enemies of the state have rights that must be respected, the fact that the senate surrendered to them Veturius and other worthy men. It is significant that the philosophical works furnish more than half of the 26 examples.

The solution of the first 88 of the 131 cases of the form *si esset—fuisset* seems thus a simple matter, but the same cannot be said of the 43 other occurrences of that form, among which are the remaining 24 cases of indirect inferential use.

#### B. *The indirect inferential of the past.*

Though *si fuisset—fuisset* was available and in frequent use to express the indirect inferential of the past, the form *si esset—fuisset* is chosen instead 24 times; e. g.,

p. Mil. 17. 45:

Vidit necesse esse Miloni proficisci Lanuvium illo ipso, quo est profectus, die itaque antevertit. At quo die? Quo, ut ante dixi, fuit insanissima contio . . . concitata; quem diem, quam con-tionem, quos clamores, nisi ad cogitatum facinus *adproperaret*, numquam *reliquisset*.<sup>1</sup>

There can be no question that the time referred to here is past; for the reference is to Clodius, for whose murder Milo was on trial at the time of speaking. By the use of the unreal conditional sentence Cicero enforces the inference that it was Clodius who set out to kill Milo (and not vice versa), suggesting, as a ground for this inference, the fact that he gave up on that day so congenial a meeting; no less important purpose could account for his hasty departure. The other cases follow;

de Orat. ii. 22. 93:

Non *potuisset* accidere ut unum genus esset omnium, nisi

<sup>1</sup> I must protest emphatically against Dittmar's arbitrary interpretation of this passage in Berl. Phil. Woch. No. 4, 1905, p. 126. The preceding sections show that it is false. Regarding the value of Dittmar's review in general I shall have more to say later in the discussion.

aliquem sibi *proponerent* ad imitandum (Greeks of Pericles' time are here referred to).

Brut. 10. 40:

Neque enim iam Troicis temporibus tantum laudis in dicendo Ulixi *tribuisset* Homerus et Nestori, . . . . nisi iam tum *esset* honos eloquentiae.

Brut. 19. 76:

qui (sc. Ennius) si illum (sc. Naevium), ut simulat, *contemneret*, non omnia bella persequens primum illud Punicum acerrimum bellum *reliquisset*.<sup>1</sup>

Orat. 9. 29:

qui (sc. Pericles) si tenui genere *uteretur*, numquam ab Aristophane poeta fulgere, tonare . . . *dictus esset*.

in Verr. ii. 1. 57. 150:

remisit D. Bruto HS cx milia. Hoc, si aliena res *esset*, certe facere non *potuisset* (referring to the time of Verres' misrule in Sicily).

in Verr. ii. 3. 20. 51:

quae si rei publicae causa *faceres*, in vendundo *essent pronuntiata* (same circumstances).

in Verr. ii. 3. 39. 89:

Profecto numquam iste tam amens *fuisse*, ut ex agro populi Romani plus frumenti servo Venerio quam populo Romano tribui pateretur, nisi omnis ea praeda servi nomine ad istum ipsum *perveniret* (same circumstances).

in Verr. ii. 3. 58. 134:

tu Apronium . . . in tanto tuo dedecore profecto <non> ne verbo quidem graviore *appellasses*, neque apud te tam sancta religio societatis *fuisse*, . . . nisi rem tam notam esse omnibus . . . *videres* (same circumstances).

in Verr. ii. 3. 64. 150:

Deinde ipse Minucius numquam habere *voluisset*, si decumas tu lege Hieronica *venderes* (same circumstances).

<sup>1</sup> Though as a matter of fact the unreality in this case is distinctly of the past, it is quite possible that Cicero is treating past as present—as he often does in quoting the words and sentiments of dead authors. If so, the case really belongs with the preceding group of indirect inferentials; cf. Blase, *Geschichte des Irrealis*, p. 9. Conversely, two cases there included (Tusc. Disp. i. 37. 89 and v. 39. 115) might be so interpreted as to belong to this group.

in Verr. ii. 5. 2. 5:

a quo illi conatu non tanto opere *prohibendi fuissent*, si ulla in Sicilia praesidia ad illorum adventum opposita *putarentur* (events of B. C. 71).

in Verr. ii. 5. 51. 133:

Cleomenes hoc dicit, sese in terram esse egressum, ut . . . milites colligeret, quos in navibus collocaret; quod certe non *fecisset*, si suum numerum naves *haberent* (Verres' misrule again).

p. Clu. 66. 189:

nihil est ab Oppianico sine consilio mulieris cogitatum; quodsi *esset*, certe postea deprehensa re non illa ut a viro improbo *discessisset*, sed . . . . *fugisset* domumque . . . . *reliquisset* (note *postea* in the apodosis).

p. Rab. Perd. 6. 18:

Numquam, mihi credite, populus Romanus hic, qui silet, consulem me *fecisset*, si vestro clamore perturbatum iri *arbitraretur* (events of B. C. 64).

p. Mur. 14. 32:

quo ille (sc. Cato maior) . . . numquam *esset profectus*, si cum mulierculis bellandum *arbitraretur*.

p. Mur. 14. 32:

Neque vero cum P. Africano senatus *egisset*, ut legatus fratri proficisceretur, . . . nisi illud grave bellum et vehemens *putaretur*.

p. Arch. 7. 16:

qui (sc. Cato maior et alii) profecto si nihil ad percipiendam . . . . virtutem litteris *adiuvarentur*, numquam se ad earum studium *contulissent*.

p. Cael. 6. 14:

Neque umquam ex illo (sc. Catilina) delendi huius imperii tam sceleratus impetus *extitisset*, nisi tot vitiorum tanta immanitas quibusdam facultatis et patientiae radicibus *niteretur*.

p. Planc. 22. 53:

Neque enim umquam maiores nostri sortitionem *constituissent* aediliciam, nisi *viderent* accidere posse, ut competitores pares suffragiis essent.

p. Mil. 23. 61:

cui (sc. Pompeio) numquam se hic (sc. Milo) profecto *tradidisset*, nisi causae suae *confideret*, praesertim omnia audienti, magna metuenti, etc. (of events antecedent to the trial).

Acad. Prior. ii. 24. 75:

Certe tam multa non *collegisset* (sc. Chrysippus), quae nos fallerent probabilitate magna, nisi *videret* iis resisti non facile posse.

Tusc. Disp. i. 12. 27:

Itaque unum illud erat insitum priscis illis . . ., esse in morte sensum . . . .; idque . . . e caerimoniis supulchrorum intellegi licet; quas maximis ingeniis praediti nec tanta cura *coluissent*, nec . . . *sanxissent*, nisi *haereret* in eorum mentibus mortem non interitum esse.

de Re P. iv. 10. 11:

Numquam comoediae, nisi consuetudo vitae *pateretur*, probare sua theatris flagitia *potuissent*.<sup>1</sup>

Lael. 4. 13:

plus apud me antiquorum auctoritas valet, vel nostrorum maiorum, qui mortuis tam religiosa iura tribuerunt, quod non *fecissent* profecto, si nihil ad eos pertinere *arbitrarentur*, vel eorum, qui . . . . .

It is certainly a curious and interesting circumstance that the indirect inferential of the past should thus often have slipped over into the form *si esset—fuisset* despite the fact that the form *si fuisset—fuisset* was available and frequently so used. The reason for the choice of the imperfect in the *si*-clause I am inclined to seek in the nature of the past indirect inferential use itself. For, it will be remembered, after disposing of the normal and the normal indirect inferential uses (88 cases), there still remained to be treated 43 examples of the form *si esset—fuisset*. This total of 43 includes the 24 cases of indirect inferential of the past now under discussion, and 19 other sentences yet to be treated; for the moment we may concede that in all these 19 cases too *si esset* refers to a past unreality. If now we compare the other form of past unreality (*si fuisset—fuisset*), the figures are as follows; indirect inferential of the past 43, other cases 412. That is to say, when the past unreal conditional sentence is used as the indirect inferential of the past, *si fuisset—fuisset* is chosen 43 times and *si esset—fuisset* 24 times; but when the sentence is not so used, *si fuisset—fuisset* is chosen 412 times and *si esset—fuisset*, at the most, not more than 19 times. In other words, the proportion of *si esset—fuisset* is seven times as great when the sentence is used to express the indirect inferential as when otherwise used. In view of that

<sup>1</sup> This sentence is a fragment; *pateretur* seems however to refer to the past.

fact it is hard to resist the conclusion that there was something in the nature of the indirect inferential use itself which favored the choice of *si esset*.

We may gain a hint as to such favoring circumstance from a study of the behavior of concise and colorless phrases such as *ni ita esset*; e. g.,

de Nat. D. ii. 2. 4:

Quid enim potest esse tam apertum . . . quam esse aliquod numen praestantissimae mentis, quo haec regantur? *Quod ni ita esset*, qui potuisset adsensu omnium dicere Ennius . . . . .?

In this passage the condition expresses an unreality of the general type.

Tusc. Disp. v. 39. 114-15:

Quid ergo? aut Homero delectationem animi ac voluptatem aut cuiquam docto defuisse umquam abitemur? aut, *ni ita se res haberet*, Anaxagoras aut hic ipse Democritus agros et patrimonium sua reliquisset . . . . .?

Here the *ni*-clause refers back to *cuiquam . . . . . defuisse umquam*, which might be considered as analogous to a gnomic perfect. On that basis the condition may be said to express a general unreality, yet this case differs somewhat from the one preceding.

p. Clu. 66. 189:

nihil est ab Oppianico sine consilio mulieris cogitatum; *quodsi esset*, certe postea deprehensa re . . . . . fugisset domumque . . . . . reliquisset.

In this passage *quodsi esset* refers back to *est cogitatum*—a case of clear and definite past unreality, as shown by *postea* in the apodosis. The following case is similar;

in Verr. ii. 3. 64. 149:

Primum tuam rem illam et praedam fuisse; nam, *ni ita esset*, cur tu Apronium malebas?<sup>1</sup>

These concise and colorless phrases therefore, though at first sight they might seem fitted to express only present or general unreality, are still an adequate expression when the speaker has in mind a clear past unreality, the reason for this being that the context fixes the time beyond a doubt, and all that absolutely needs expression is unreality; this these phrases convey by falling

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also p. Clu. 33. 90, Phil. xi. 12. 27 and Sallust, B. C. 52. 19.

into unreality's most universal and comprehensive form, namely *si esset*. The present indicative has a quite analogous use; e. g.,

p. Rab. Perd. 10. 29:

At, credo, cum . . . . . obsidione rem publicam liberasset (sc. Marius), omnia sua secum una moritura arbitrabatur. *Non ita est*, Quirites.

Now the indirect inferential use in general is designed to lead the hearer to arrive (by inference) at the *truth* or *falsity* of some proposition; that is, to lead him to the judgment "*ita est*" or "*non ita est*". In other words, the thing that the speaker needs most to impress is the unreality of the condition—on his success in doing this his whole argument depends. Thus, in the case of the indirect inferential of the past, the gist of the sentence is "Things would have been otherwise, *were* it (not) true that . . . . .". With the thought of unreality thus uppermost, and with the time clearly defined by the context (as it is regularly in the 24 cases now under discussion), it would not be strange if the speaker at times dropped into the form *si esset—fuisset*, choosing unreality's most universal and comprehensive form (cf. *ni ita esset* above). If this be the favoring factor that allowed the free use of the form *si esset—fuisset* as an expression for the indirect inferential of the past, the situation is somewhat analogous to that of *dum* with the present indicative in *past* narration.

How well, on occasion, the apodosis and the context may set the time for the whole of a past unreal conditional sentence is illustrated by a few instances of the indirect inferential of the past whose condition finds expression in a prepositional phrase or the like—forms suggesting unreality, but which, in and for themselves, are absolutely incapable of expressing time relation;

Tusc. Disp. iv. 19. 44:

Philosophiae denique ipsius principes numquam in suis studiis tantos progressus *sine flagranti cupiditate* facere potuissent.

By changing the phrase to *nisi flagrantem cupiditatem haberent* and placing it at the end of the sentence, we should have a case precisely like those under discussion.<sup>1</sup> So the following;

de Div. i. 19. 38:

ut igitur nunc in minore gloria est (sc. oraculum), quia minus oraculorum veritas excellit, sic tum *nisi summa veritate* in tanta gloria non fuisset.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Also ad Att. iv. 15. 2; cf. Tusc. Disp. i. 25. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. ad Att. vii. 7. 3; p. Cael. 26. 63.

Some interesting points of difference are brought to light by a comparison of *si esset—fuisset* (24 cases) and *si fuisset—fuisset* (43 cases) as expressions for the indirect inferential of the past.

a) The rule for the order of clauses is not the same. In the case of the form *si esset—fuisset* the condition precedes in only 8 of 24 examples, whereas, when the form *si fuisset—fuisset* is chosen, it precedes in 26 of the 43 cases. To put these figures in another way, when the condition precedes, only 8 of 34 examples choose the form *si esset*; but when it follows, 16 of 33 make that choice. It would seem therefore that the postposition of the condition favored slipping over into the form *si esset—fuisset*. If so, the reason may be that, with this order, the speaker is more free to concentrate on the unreality of the clause, the time having been definitely set by the apodosis which precedes.

b) Both groups show an unusually large percentage of *nisi*. Sentences of the form *si esset—fuisset* have this particle in 12 of 24 cases, while those of the form *si fuisset—fuisset* show it 16 times in a total of 43. The reason is that the indirect inferential is quite as apt to fall into the form "Things would not have been as they were, *unless* my contention were just" as into the form "If your contention were just, things would not have been as they were."

Considering both introductory particle and position of the conditional clause, the most common type of the form *si esset—fuisset* is *fuisset, nisi esset* (10 in a total of 24), while in the case of the pluperfect the stock form *si fuisset—fuisset* is the common type (20 in total of 43).

c) A speaker's tone and manner may easily outweigh mere distinction of form, but so far as formal elements are themselves concerned, *si esset—fuisset* is clearly more assertive and less persuasive than *si fuisset—fuisset*. This is shown in various ways;

1) Asseverative particles (*numquam, umquam, certe, profecto*), accompany *si esset—fuisset* in 17 of 24 cases, while with *si fuisset—fuisset* they are found in but 18 of 43 cases.<sup>1</sup>

2) No case of *si esset—fuisset* in the interrogative form is noted, whereas 9 of the 43 cases of *si fuisset—fuisset* are questions.

<sup>1</sup> Or in 21 of 43 cases, if we count one doubtful occurrence of *certe* (ad Att. vii. 7. 1) and two cases in which *umquam* falls within the *si*-clause (p. Planc. 37. 90 and ad Fam. iii. 8. 5). In the totals as given are included cases in which *numquam* and *profecto* reinforce one another (three times with *si esset—fuisset* and twice with *si fuisset—fuisset*).

The interrogative form is manifestly adapted to lead the hearer to an inference rather than to force him to it.

3) The order of clauses perhaps bears on this question. The condition precedes much more often in the case of *si fuisset—fuisset*;<sup>1</sup> this arrangement of clauses lends itself readily to induction.

The indirect inferential use of the unreal conditional sentence in general has not been altogether unnoticed,<sup>2</sup> but I think no one has anticipated me in observing the great frequency with which the indirect inferential of the past falls into the form *si esset—fuisset*. That there is an inner connection between the two things seems certain, whether I have succeeded in finding that connection or not. Whether we should recognize also other forces not yet mentioned as exerting some influence toward the choice of the form *si esset—fuisset* is a debatable question. If operative, their influence was slight—at least so far as the 24 cases now under discussion are concerned; that they were operative, is by no means proved.

For instance, a case of indirect inferential of the past which takes the form *si esset—fuisset* is most commonly passed with the remark that the imperfect tense is chosen because the *si*-clause expresses continuous or repeated past unreality. But what of the following cases of indirect inferential of the past which take the form *si fuisset—fuisset*?

de Orat. i. 59. 253:

Sed tamen non *fugisset* hoc Graecos homines, si ita necesse esse *arbitrati essent* oratorem ipsum erudire in iure civili.

Part. Orat. 34. 117:

dicendum de vi doloris, de opinione maiorum; qui rem totam nisi *probassent*, certe *repudiassent*.

in Verr. ii. 4. 7. 13:

Numquam, si denariis cccc Cupidinem illum *putasset*, *com-misisset* ut . . . . in tantam vituperationem veniret.

p. Clu. 41. 116:

Quae res si rei iudicatae pondus *habuisset*, ille postea . . . . reus hac lege ipsa *factus esset*.

<sup>1</sup> The ratio is not affected by the interrogative cases just noted; for, as to order, they are about evenly divided (5 and 4).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, § 412.

p. Rab. Perd. 10. 29:

tantis in laboribus C. Marius periculisque *vixisset*, si nihil longius, quam vitae termini postulabant, spe atque animo de se et gloria sua *cogitasset*?

p. Mur. 16. 34:

si bellum hoc, si hic hostis, si ille rex *contemnendus fuisset*, neque tanta cura senatus . . . . . suscipiendum *putasset* neque tot annos *gessisset* . . . . .

in Pis. 20. 48:

praesidium tu rei publicae . . . inussu populi senatusque *dimisisses*, si tuae mentis compos *fuisses*?

Phil. v. 5. 15:

Hos ille demens iudices *legisset*, . . . . . si ullam speciem rei publicae *cogitavisset*?

Acad. Prior. ii. 23. 74

Quid dicam de Platone? qui certe tam multis libris haec *persecutus non esset*, nisi *probavisset*.

de Div. i. 19. 37:

Numquam illud oraculum Delphis tam celebre et tam clarum *fuisset*, . . . . nisi omnis aetas oraculorum illorum veritatem *esset experta*.<sup>1</sup>

Obviously *si fuisset*, as well as *si esset*, is used freely when a continuous or repeated past unreality is referred to. The advocates of the view that *si esset* is chosen because a continuous or repeated past unreality is to be expressed have therefore their case still to prove. We might ask further what is to be done with a case like the following;

Tusc. Disp. i. 12. 27:

quas (sc. caerimonias) maximis ingeniis praediti non tanta cura *coluissent* . . . . . nisi *haereret* in eorum mentibus mortem non interitum esse.

<sup>1</sup> These examples are taken somewhat at random. The remaining 33 cases of this form are as follows; Auct. ad Her. iv. 14, 20, de Invent. i. 47. 87, Brut. 14. 53, p. Quinct. 12. 40, p. Q. Rosc. i. 2, in Verr. i. 7. 18, ii. i. 14. 37, ii. 3. 58. 133, ii. 4. 12. 29, p. Clu. 54. 148, in Cat. iii. 9. 22, p. Sulla 13. 39, p. Flacc. 37. 92, p. Cael. 7. 15, 19. 47, p. Planc. 37. 90 fin., p. Mil. 6. 15, 10. 27, Phil. iii. 3. 6, xi. 10. 23, xiii. 12. 27, ad Fam. iii. 8. 5, vii. 2. 3, ad Att. vii. 7. 1, de Fin. ii. 19, 61, iii. 22, 75, Tusc. Disp. i. 14. 32, iv. 3. 5, de Nat. D. i. 23. 63, de Div. ii. 22. 49, ii. 46. 97, de Leg. ii. 13. 33 (2 cases).

If continuity or repetition of unreality is the test, why not *colerent* in the apodosis as well as *haereret* in the protasis?<sup>1</sup>

Of course there remains the subterfuge (if any have the heart to resort to it after viewing the last example) that the speaker recognized the continuous or repeated character of the past unreality by the use of the form *si esset—fuisset*, but shut his eyes to it when he chose the form *si fuisset—fuisset*. This does very well for assertion, but where is the proof? Furthermore, what is to be said of a passage like the following, where the pluperfect is used in a situation such that one cannot shut his eyes to the continuity of the unreality?

p. Sest. 35. 76:

Quorum ille telis libenter in tanto luctu ac desiderio mei, non repugnandi, sed moriendi causa, corpus *obtulisset* suum, nisi suam vitam ad spem mei reditus *reservasset*.

In this sentence the condition cannot mean anything but "unless he *had been reserving*", the other interpretation would make *reservasset* refer to some previous occasion, and thus destroy the sense of the passage. So again;

de Fin. iii. 22. 75:

rectius dives (sc. sapiens appellabitur) quam Crassus, qui nisi *eguisset*, numquam Euphraten nulla belli causa transire *voluisset*.

As for repeated or customary past unreality, the frequentative verb tells its own story in the following passage;

de Div. ii. 46. 97:

Nam quod aiunt quadringenta septuaginta milia annorum in periclitandis . . . pueris . . . Babylonios posuisse, fallunt; si enim *esset factilatam*, non *esset desitum*.

Thus, at every point, confirmation is lacking for the thesis that continued or repeated past unreality demands expression through the form *si esset*. Not only is this not a principle of general application, but we might be justified in hesitating to recognize it as even a small contributing factor toward the choice of the form *si esset—fuisset* for the 24 cases of indirect inferential of the past now under discussion—at least until some further proof is offered.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So p. Arch. 7. 16; cf. in Verr. ii. 3. 58. 134, ii. 3. 64. 150.

<sup>2</sup> Such proof would naturally be sought, not among the cases where the indirect inferential use is manifestly influencing the choice of tense, but among the cases of survival of the early use of the imperfect subjunctive as an expression for the simple past unreal. Of this survival there seem to be

The doctrine of "Gleichzeitigkeit" also lacks confirmation. Its most attractive interpretation may be illustrated by the use of the following example;

in Verr. ii. 3. 64. 150:

Deinde ipse Minucius numquam habere *voluisset*, si decumas tu lege Hieronica *venderes*.

The commonest type of conditional sentence informs the hearer that one thing (entails or) would entail another. It sometimes happens that the first thing "laps over" on the time of the thing entailed. Thus we have a species of Gleichzeitigkeit, and such is the case with the example in hand—"had you been selling, etc.". It is possible that some useful application may ultimately be found for this interpretation of the doctrine of Gleichzeitigkeit, but for the present it lacks confirmation as applied to the indirect inferentials of the past which take the form *si esset—fuisset*.

For, if the reader will turn back to the cases of *si fuisset—fuisset* quoted in full, it will be seen at once that the action of the protasis there too often laps over upon that of the apodosis; e. g.,

in Verr. ii. 4. 7. 13:

Numquam, si denariis cccc Cupidinem illum *putasset*, *com-misisset* ut . . . . . in tantam vituperationem veniret.

Of course it may be said that, with the form *si fuisset*, the speaker shuts his eyes to the lapping over; but that again is assertion and not proof. Furthermore, even that way of escape is closed by a case like the following;

p. Sest. 35. 76:

Quorum ille telis libenter in tanto luctu ac desiderio mei, non repugnandi, sed moriendi causa, corpus *obtulisset* suum, nisi suam vitam ad spem mei reditus *reservasset*.

For, as above shown, the condition cannot mean "unless he had reserved"—it must signify "unless he *had been reserving*",

traces here and there in Cicero, especially in the earlier orations, apodosis and protasis alike being affected. In such an investigation, cases of *si fuisset* like those above quoted may not be ignored. That there are such cases should occasion no surprise; for, when the imperfect subjunctive moved up to become the expression of the present unreal, it naturally left to the pluperfect the field of the past unreal (I speak here of independent sentences only)—and a continuous past or a repeated past is a *past* nevertheless. Furthermore, this question should not be in any way prejudiced by the behavior of the imperfect *indicative* in Greek—a wholly distinct problem.

i. e., the lapping over must be recognized in order to make sense of the passage.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the fact that these current doctrines thus lack confirmation—so much so that it is problematical whether we should, at present, admit even a slight influence from the forces which they assume—Dittmar has lately made another attempt,<sup>2</sup> on virtually the old conventional grounds, to dispose of some of the indirect inferentials of the past which take the form *si esset—fuisset*. What is more, in trying to find a justification for applying the old line of explanation, he has fallen into the serious error of denying to the form *si esset—fuisset* the power to act as the expression of the indirect inferential of the past—an error into which he need not have fallen had he examined carefully even the scanty material on which he ventures to build a theory (4 cases of *si esset—fuisset* and 3 of *si fuisset—fuisset*); e. g.,

in Verr. ii. 5. 51. 133:

Cleomenes hoc dicit, sese in terram esse egressum, ut . . . milites colligeret, quos in navibus collocaret; quod certe non *fecisset*, si suum numerum naves *haberent*; ea est ratio instructarum ornatarumque navium, ut non modo plures, sed ne singuli quidem possint accedere.

This, Dittmar says, is not a case of indirect inferential use, because Cicero is not trying to prove that the ships were insufficiently manned (i. e. trying to force the hearer to admit the unreality of *si haberent*); for that point is already settled beyond

<sup>1</sup> Another interpretation of the doctrine of Gleichzeitigkeit perhaps ought to be noticed, namely that *si esset* expresses past unreality contemporaneous with that of the apodosis, in the same way that *cum esset* expresses action contemporaneous with that of its main clause; in other words, that *si esset* is chosen in obedience to the law of sequence of tenses; see Lindskog, *De enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium condicionalibus*, Lundae, 1895, p. 91 ff., and cf. Tischer and Sorof on *Tusc. Disp. i. 12. 27*. Such a view is not merely unconfirmed—it seems in fact to be utterly subversive of all sound doctrine regarding the nature of the conditional sentence in general. For it overlooks the important fact that, in the conditional sentence, it is the *si*-clause that exerts a controlling influence over the apodosis, and not vice versa. While in our grammatical terminology the *si*-clause and the *cum*-clause are both counted "dependent", their logical relation to the "main" clause is fundamentally different. Here again I speak of independent conditional sentences only.

<sup>2</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch. No. 4, 1905, p. 123 ff.*

a doubt—the real question at issue is whether Verres took a bribe to let the crews go.<sup>1</sup>

But the clause following the conditional sentence (which seems to have escaped Dittmar's notice) shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that Cicero *is* demonstrating that the ships were insufficiently manned—there is not a clearer case of indirect inferential use among the examples with which Dittmar is working; in fact Cicero has all but put his thought in the form of a syllogism—"a thing which he would not have done, if the ships had had their full quota; *for ships fully equipped are so arranged that not even individuals may be added, to say nothing of groups.*"<sup>2</sup> It may seem strange at first sight that Cicero should, in this ponderous way, proceed to prove something that his audience in general might be supposed to have little doubt about; but in this passage he represents himself as addressing Verres face to face, and the latter would not of course be ready to admit anything likely to prejudice his case. A little further along, (§ 135) the question at issue between them in this passage is definitely indicated—*Quapropter, si mihi respondere voles, haec dicito, classem instructam atque ornatam fuisse, nullum propugnatores a fuisse*, etc.

As soon as the indirect inferential use of the form *si esset—fuisset* is admitted, the rest of Dittmar's hastily built structure falls to pieces, and it is not necessary to discuss it further here. However to avoid misconception, I should perhaps add that an indirect inferential is sometimes merely part of a larger context, i. e. that the inference up to which it leads is only one step in a chain of argument. Examples of this sort are frequent, those of the past taking either form (*si esset—fuisset* or *si fuisset—*

<sup>1</sup> To quote his words exactly, Hier steht nicht in Frage, ob die Schiffe des Cleomenes ihre volle Zahl hatten (diese Frage war doch eben durch die Tatsache entschieden, dass Cleomenes erst neue Soldaten sammelte), sondern es steht in Frage, ob Verres um Geld Ruderer und Soldaten entlassen hat (vgl. § 131), und um diese Frage im bejahenden Sinne zu beantworten, weist Cicero auf die Tatsache hin, dass Cleomenes neue Soldaten sammelte, was er eben doch nur deswegen tat, weil seine Schiffe nicht ihre volle Bemannung aufwiesen.

<sup>2</sup> The added clause supplies the major premise, the apodosis implies the minor premise, and the *si*-clause suggests the inference that must be drawn;

Ships fully equipped can not take on even one additional man.

Cleomenes was taking them on by wholesale.

∴ The quota of his ships was not full.

*fuisset*).<sup>1</sup> But whether standing alone or used as part of a larger context, the inferential nature of the sentence is the same.

### 3. The remaining cases of *si esset*—*fuisset*.

There still remain 19 examples of the use of the form *si esset*—*fuisset* which have not yet been treated. Some of these fall into well defined groups;

a) In a complex passage, a sentence begun with *si fuisset* occasionally continues with *si esset*; e. g.,

p. Flacc. 5. 11:

Hi si Graeci *fuisset*, ac nisi nostri mores ac disciplina plus *valeret*, quam dolor ac simultas, omnes se spoliatos . . . *dixissent*.

de Har. Resp. 22. 47:

An iste nisi primo se *dedisset* iis, quorum . . . , nisi eos in caelum suis laudibus praeclarus auctor *extolleret*, etc., tam crudelis mei . . . . vexator esse *potuisset*?

So de Dom. 50. 129, p. Sest. 20. 45: similar are de Orat. i. 57. 245 and p. Mil. 29. 79.<sup>2</sup>

b) The futurum in praeterito relation is suggested;

p. Mil. 25. 68:

Quae si non *probaret*, . . . . si denique Italia a dilectu, urbs ab armis sine Milonis clade numquam *esset conquietura*, ne ista haud dubitans *cessisset* patria.

In the following passages the choice of the imperfect subjunctive in the *si*-clause may have come about through analogy to the futurum in praeterito usage;

in Verr. ii. 1. 55. 143:

At erat et *esset* amplius, si *velles*, populo *cautum* praedibus et praediis.

<sup>1</sup> It was part of Dittmar's theory that the form *si fuisset*—*fuisset* is not so used. But see de Nat. D. i. 23. 63, de Div. i. 19. 37, de Leg. ii. 13. 33; cf. de Div. ii. 22. 49. The distinction which Dittmar draws in this respect between p. Mur. 14. 32 and 16. 34 is certainly doubtful, and that between p. Mil. 10. 27 and 17. 45 is clearly forced—the context is exactly parallel.

<sup>2</sup> Reisig, Vorlesungen über lat. Sprach. iii. § 301, assigns the change of tense in such passages to the desire to avoid monotony; cf. Blase, Dissertationes Argentoratenses, Vol. x. p. 73. That the imperfect *follows* the pluperfect in these cases is a fact worthy of notice. An interesting example in indirect discourse is afforded by de Invent. ii. 45. 130–31. Cf. p. Cael. 7. 16 (*ut*), and de Leg. i. 15. 42.

Phil. ii. 2. 3:

Sed neque fecisti, nec, si *cuperes*, tibi id per C. Caecinam facere *licuisset*.

ad Att. xvi. 5. 2:

Quintus fuit mecum dies complures, et, si ego *cuperem*, ille vel plures *fuisset*.

In each of these sentences the apodosis is of such a nature that one cannot help feeling the parallel force of cases like the following;

in Cat. iii. 5. 11:

Si quid de his rebus dicere *vellet*, feci potestatem.<sup>1</sup>

In fact, for the apodoses above we could substitute expressions of willingness or unwillingness without seriously affecting the sense; e. g. (ad Att. xvi. 5. 2) "and he was willing to have stayed longer, *si ego cuperem*." Possibly I miss here the clue to the choice of tense in the *si*-clause, yet it must be admitted that speech usage is at times influenced by just such subtle connections as this.

c) The remaining 9 cases are somewhat less certain. It is to be expected that odd examples would be found in the works of a writer like Cicero—so extensive and varied, and distributed over so long a period. Rather than lay myself open to the charge of forcing cases into categories already established, I pass without comment de Orat. i. 22. 104, ii. 55. 224 (Crassus), Brut. 67. 238, post red. in sen. 14. 34, ad Att. iii. 10. 2, xiii. 45. 3. In the case of p. Q. Rosc. 17. 50 and Phil. ii. 32. 81 the apodosis may be an independent subjunctive. As for ad Att. iii. 7. 1, *optatum* (in *esset optatum*) is probably an adjective.

#### IV. THE REALM OF THE FUTURE.

Under this heading I would call attention to a few cases of the unreal conditional sentence in which the unreality runs over into the *speaker's* future. This is a matter quite distinct from the question of the futurum in praeterito usage, which has already been noticed in a previous section of this paper. That the unreal conditional sentence should thus invade the realm of the future is a wholly natural proceeding, and a phenomenon perhaps more frequent in English than in Latin. A sentence taken from the speech of the mother of Coriolanus affords a clear illustration;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in Caecil. 10. 32, in Verr. ii. 3. 31. 73.

Livy ii. 40. 8:

Ergo ego nisi peperissem, Roma non oppugnaretur; nisi filium haberem, libera in libera patria *mortua essem*.

Of course the speaker does not mean that she would have died already, but that the *prospect* of a peaceful death is cut off by her son's actions. Even Plautus, with his somewhat restricted use of the secondary tenses of the subjunctive in *si*-clauses, still shows there clear traces of this running over of the unreal into the speaker's future. It is however the Ciceronian use with which we are primarily concerned at the present time. The examples fall under several different heads;

a) The future sense may be marked by the use of the active periphrastic; e. g.,

in Caecil. 13. 43:

Ac si tibi nemo *responsurus esset*, tamen ipsam causam, ut ego arbitror, demonstrare non posses.

Cicero is here speaking of the (coming) trial of Verres. He tells Caecilius that he could not handle the case, even though there *were going to be* no defence. So the following examples;

de Leg. Agr. ii. 31. 85:

Quae, etiamsi ad vos *esset* singulos aliquid ex hoc agro *per-venturum*, qui vobis ostenditur, aliis comparatur, tamen honestius eum vos universi quam singuli possideretis.

Cato M. 23. 82:

An censes . . . me tantos labores diurnos nocternosque domi militiaeque suscepturum fuisse, si isdem finibus gloriam meam, quibus vitam, *essem terminaturus*?<sup>1</sup>

Less often it is the apodosis that contains the periphrastic form;

ad Fam. vi. 9. 2:

Reliquum est ut . . . nihil a te petam, nisi ut ad eam voluntatem, quam tua sponte erga Caecinam *habiturus esses*,<sup>2</sup> tantus cumulus accedat commendatione mea, quanti me a te fieri intellego.

In this connection might be added the following example, in which *aliquando* gives something of the suggestion of the periphrastic;

<sup>1</sup> So ad Fam. iv. 7. 4, ad Att. x. 8. 2, xi. 15. 2; cf. ad Fam. xiii. i. 5, de Fin. iv. 22. 62.

<sup>2</sup> The reading *habiturus es* has some support.

p. Sest. 38. 83:

Ac si tum P. Sestius . . . in templo Castoris animam . . . edidisset, non dubito quin, si modo esset in re publica senatus, si maiestas populi Romani revixisset, *aliquando* statua huic ob rem publicam interfecto in foro statueretur.<sup>1</sup>

b) The indirect explanatory use of the unreal conditional sentence (described in detail in section II) is often responsible for an encroachment upon the realm of the future. Thus, when a speaker wishes to remind or inform his hearer why he fails to do something that might be expected of him, instead of stating the reason directly, he may imply it by the use of a sentence of the following form "I *would do* so, were it not for the fact that, etc." The unreality is apt to run over into the future in such a case; e. g.,

ad Fam. xvi. 15. 1:

Plura scriberem, si iam putarem lubenter te legere posse.

The purpose of this sentence obviously is to explain to Tiro why Cicero does not proceed to lengthen the letter.<sup>2</sup> Such examples of the indirect explanatory use are found very frequently in the epistles;

ad Fam. vi. 6. 4:

Dicerem, quae ante futura dixissem, ni vererer, ne ex eventis fingere viderer.

ad Fam. xiii. 24. 3:

Scriberem ad te, qualis vir esset, . . . nisi eum iam per se ipsum tibi satis notum esse arbitrarer.

ad Att. xii. 39. 2:

De tabellariis facerem, quod suades, si essent ullae necessariae litterae, ut erant olim.<sup>3</sup>

The imperfect is the tense most used, but the pluperfect is also found;

ad Fam. vii. 2. 1:

Quod si mihi permisisses, qui meus amor in te est, confecissem cum coheredibus; nunc . . . inlicitatorem potius ponam, quam illud minoris veneat.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> De Har. Resp. 8. 17 affords perhaps a similar case.

<sup>2</sup> So in Plautus; e. g., Most. 843-44; *Eho, istum, puere, circumduce hasce aedis et conclavia. Nam egomet ductarem, nisi mi esset apud forum negotium*; cf. Pers. 45. Ps. 640.

<sup>3</sup> So ad Fam. xii. 4. 2, xiv. 7. 2, ad Att. ii. 14. 2, vii. 7. 7 (*diutius*); Brut. 62. 223, Tusc. Disp. v. 14. 42: cf. p. Sulla 23. 64.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. ad Fam. xiii. 66. 2 and Auct. ad Her. iv. 49. 62.

In this case the future *ponam* touches the same time realm as does *confecissem*. If Marius had put the matter without restrictions into Cicero's hands, the latter would have proceeded to make an arrangement with the coheirs; but now (he says jestingly) he will try to keep the price up.<sup>1</sup>

c) It is perhaps worth while to consider separately one or two examples in which the unreality of the *si*-clause centers in some other word (or phrase) than the verb; e. g.,

in Verr. ii. 1. 17. 44:

nihil *dicam* nisi singulare, nisi id, quod si *in alium reum* diceretur, incredibile videretur.

The unreality of the condition here manifestly centers in the phrase *in alium reum*, not in *diceretur*; for Cicero is going to tell the thing, the time being set by *dicam*. That Cicero's thought here fell into the unreal form (instead of the ideal) shows in an interesting way how familiar he must have been with the invasion of the realm of the future on the part of the unreal conditional sentence. Compare the following example;

de Leg. Agr. ii. 25. 67:

"Idcirco" inquit "agros nominare non possum, quia *tangam* nullum ab invito." Hoc, Quirites, multo est quaestuosius, quam si *ab invito* sumeret; *inibitur*<sup>2</sup> enim ratio quaestus . . . et . . . ager *emetur*<sup>3</sup> . . . . .

#### V. THE CONCESSIVE UNREAL.

The concessive *si*-clause with verb in the subjunctive mood presents a most interesting historical problem in Latin as regards the form of conclusion. With Plautus, concessive *si sit* (often unreal) and *si esset* take an indicative conclusion three times as often as a subjunctive—always so, if my observation is correct, when the verb is one of those we ordinarily class as modal.<sup>4</sup> In Cicero, on the other hand, the ratio is more than reversed; concessive *si esset*, for instance, is followed by a subjunctive conclusion six times as often as by an indicative, and modal verbs are put

<sup>1</sup> For other cases where the future indicative thus parallels the unreal subjunctive, see de Orat. 1. 42. 190, p. Sex. Rosc. 20. 83 fin., p. Rab. Perd. 6. 19, p. Sulla 1. 2, 3. 10, 16. 47, p. Flacc. 16. 38, ad Att. ii. 14. 2; cf. p. Caec. 32. 93, ad Fam. iii. 10. 2, de Leg. ii. 7. 18.

<sup>2</sup> This one future (of the three in the passage) rests on conjecture.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. perhaps p. Q. Rosc. 15. 45.

<sup>4</sup> The facts are given in detail in the University of California Publications, Classical Philology, Vol. I. p. 66 ff.

in the subjunctive with the greatest freedom. This marked intrusion of the subjunctive into the conclusion of the concessive unreal was doubtless due, in part at least, to a growing appreciation of symmetry and balance in verbal expression and a more definite conception of *si esset—esset, si fuisset—fuisset*, etc., as normal combinations—a conception that could not but be fostered by the great masses of pure conditional sentences which naturally fall into those forms.<sup>1</sup>

The reason for Plautus' preference for the indicative in the conclusion is not far to seek. For the conclusion of a concessive sentence of the type under discussion has, so to speak, a double rôle to play; thus, when the *si*-clause is unreal, it is the function of the conclusion to inform the hearer that what *is* still *would be*, even though circumstances were other than they are. Now Plautus prefers to express what *is*, allowing the hearer to gather that it still *would be*; e. g.,

Ps. 291:

Atque adeo, si facere possim, pietas *prohibet*.

We (with Cicero) prefer the other alternative of stating what *would be*, leaving it to the hearer to gather that it likewise *is*—“And, what's more, even though I could, my sense of duty *would check me*”. Though Plautus' choice produces a form of sentence that may seem to us rough, nevertheless its logic is sound; indeed, he might perhaps sit in judgment on us (and Cicero) who prefer the other alternative—a choice which means that we use the form of present unreality in reference to something that actually *is*.

A study of the few cases in Plautus in which a concessive *si*-clause containing the subjunctive is followed by a subjunctive conclusion brings to light at least one of the factors that favored the intrusion of that mood into the conclusion; e. g.,

Aul. 555 ff.:

Quos si Argus servet, qui oculus totus fuit,  
Is numquam servet.

Euclio is distressed for fear the cooks will steal something, and means to say that, if even Argus were watching them, they could not be kept from pilfering. Had he been content to say just this, the conclusion would without doubt have been *possunt*. But the

<sup>1</sup> According to Dittmar, I am wholly mistaken on this point; see *Philologische Rundschau*, No. 8, 1906, p. 174 ff.

emphasis upon *Argus* in the *si*-clause is so great that it tempts the speaker to resume with *is* in the conclusion, and he finds himself committed by this choice of subject to a paraphrase of the thought "the cooks can and could not be kept from pilfering". Choosing *servare* as his verb, he may not make his conclusion a statement of fact ("even he by no means keeps them in check"), for Argus has nothing to do with the actual situation; all he can say is "even he by no means *would* keep them in check." So Bacch. 697, Men. 238 ff.<sup>1</sup>

Aside from these examples, there seem to be in Plautus only four other cases where a concessive *si*-clause containing the subjunctive is followed by a subjunctive conclusion. These additional sentences have, in common with the three already treated, a strongly stressed word or phrase in the *si*-clause, but here there is no resumptive word in the conclusion. Yet the phrasing of the conclusion in each case is such as would exactly fit a resumptive element; e. g.,

Truc. 527-28:

† Sih plane ex medio mari

savium petere tuom iubeas, petere hau pigeat, mel meum.<sup>2</sup>

In this sentence the speaker proceeds with the conclusion just as though he had resumed *ex medio mari* by *illinc* or the like, and had thus committed himself to a statement of what *would be*; for *illinc* (cf. *is* in Aul. 555 ff.), would necessarily confine his remark to the supposed case, thus precluding a simple statement of the present situation (e. g. "I am ready"). Apparently Plautus felt some resumptive force in such a case, though it does not find direct expression in the text. If so, the explanation of the presence of the subjunctive in the conclusion would be the same here as for the three sentences first taken up.

We might say therefore that the subjunctive in the conclusion of concessive *si*-clauses of the forms *si sit* and *si esset* was on sufferance with Plautus. At any rate his recourse to this choice of mood seems to be limited to cases in which he becomes involved in a particular kind of sentence where the customary

<sup>1</sup> In view of Dittmar's quite unfounded inference (l. c. p. 176) I should perhaps state that my argument here does not rest on a belief in the old ontological theory of mood meaning. Though one does not subscribe to that theory, he need not blind himself to the fact that *bonum est* is the recognized form to express what *is*, whereas *bonum sit* and *bonum esset* are typical expressions of what *would be*.

<sup>2</sup> So Tri. 885 ff., Truc. 315 ff., Most. 241 ff.

indicative is almost perforce excluded; when left to his own devices he consistently prefers to state what *is*, leaving it to the hearer to infer that the same thing still *would be*. Even in some cases where he goes so far as to commit himself by the use of a resumptive word in the conclusion to a statement of what *would be*, the use of the subjunctive seems to have been escaped through the choice of a modal verb; see, for instance, *Amph.* 450 ff.

In Cicero a very general levelling has taken place—even modal verbs and expressions have for the most part yielded to the pressure. For instance, *si esset* is used in the concessive sense approximately 160 times, but out of this total the indicative appears in conclusion in only 22 cases. Even when the modal expressions are singled out and considered separately, the preponderance of the subjunctive is still decisive (39 subjunctive, 12 indicative).

In the 22 cases of indicative conclusion with *si esset* the tense is regularly past. This, as Blase has explained,<sup>1</sup> may be a consequence of the shift of the present unreal from the form *si sit* to *si esset*; thus, Plautus can very well say *Qui si decem habeas linguas, mutum esse addecet* (*Bacch.* 128), but as soon as the shift is made to *Qui si decem haberes linguas*, it becomes hard to retain the present *addecet*. However Cicero does this very thing once or twice; e. g., *de Har. Resp.* 1. 2. A clearer case is found with the concessive clause in the form *si fuisset*;

*Lael.* 27. 104:

*si illis plane orbatus essem, magnum tamen adfert mihi aetas ipsa solacium.*

In closing the discussion it may be worth while to emphasize the large concessive use of the *si*-clause. Thus, of about 750 cases of *si esset—esset*, almost exactly 140 are concessive sentences. In this total of 140 are included 18 examples in which *si* is reenforced by *etiam*; 78 more have *tamen* in the conclusion, and 9 others have some formal mark of the concessive sentence (e. g. *ne si quidem*, "not even if"); the remaining cases are defined by the context merely.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

<sup>1</sup> *Dissertationes Argentoratenses*, Vol. x. p. 95 ff.; he here credits Foth with the original suggestion.

### III.—EPIGRAPHICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF ATTIC COMEDY.

It so happens that the extant fragments of the four sets of parallel records which, in their original form, gave a complete history of the comic contests at Athens do not supplement each other at any point in such a manner as to fill out the most serious gaps in our knowledge. The Victors'-lists IG. II 971 defg (Dionysia) and iklmn (Lenaea) give us practically continuous records for considerable periods of time. If we could satisfactorily interpret them they would give us a solid basis for the chronology of Attic comedy during the fifth and fourth centuries. The names are arranged in the chronological order of first victories, but unless we know the precise dates of the first victories of representative poets here and there we must remain content with a general knowledge of relations. The documents which might have furnished these precise dates fail us at critical points; neither the didascalic notices extant in the hypotheses to Aristophanes, nor the Roman didascalic inscription IG. XIV 1098 a, 1097, 1098, nor the Fasti IG. II 971, supply the date of a single important first victory. The notices of first appearances and first victories found in various literary sources give material help, but generally not where help is most needed, as for example in the period covered by the career of Aristophanes. At this point the uncertainty as to whether the poet himself or the didascalus who trained the chorus for him was officially recognized as victor adds to our perplexity. Is the name of Aristophanes to be supplied in the Victors'-lists, or was he supplanted by Callistratus and Philonides in the honor roll except when he brought out a play himself?

The failure of conclusive direct testimony on these and similar problems forces us to resort to indirect methods, to combinations of various kinds which may lead to the determination, in the first instance, of facts which in themselves may be of little consequence, but always in the hope that through them we may reach conclusions of a higher order of importance for literary history. Thus the minor problems which are first discussed in this paper lead up to the larger question just mentioned, whether the poet or his

didascalus was officially recognized as competitor in the dramatic contests, and the solution of this question involves in turn the whole problem of the reconstruction of the Roman didascaliae and the determination of at least the larger chronological relations of the two comic Victors'-lists. The principal conclusions which are here reached were summarily indicated in the last number of this Journal (p. 85) in a review of Wilhelm's remarkable book, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen*; it is the aim of this paper to supply the considerations by which the writer was led to these conclusions.

*The Duration of the Synchoregia.*

"In the archonship of this Callias Aristotle says that it was decreed that two persons together should serve as choregi for tragedy and comedy at the Dionysia". The scholiast to Arist. Ran. 404 who thus quotes Aristotle clearly meant the Callias of 406/5 (*ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ Καλλίου*), in whose year the *Frogs* were produced, and not the archon of 412/11. In A. J. P. XVII (1896), 319 ff., I endeavored to show that the verses in the *Frogs* on which this comment was written contain a direct, though covert, reference to this innovation (cf. *σὺ γὰρ κατ' ἐσχίσω . . . κἄγεῦρες ὥστ' ἀζημίους παίξειν τε καὶ χορεύειν*) and tend to confirm the scholiast's assertion as to the date of the new arrangement; and also that the phrase *τὰ Διονύσια* must be strictly interpreted as referring to the City Dionysia alone. As regards the duration of the synchoregia, which was evidently an emergency arrangement, no definite evidence was then available. Such as there was, however, seemed to me to point to about a decade for tragedy and perhaps a half-century for comedy. Accordingly the victory of Aristophanes with two choregi (p. 184, below) could only be dated 405-388, and that of Cephisodotus (p. 322; cf. A. J. P. XXI, p. 51) in 402 with a single choregus (Lys. 21. 4) seemed probably a Lenaeon victory. The latter date has since been used as a fixed point in the chronology of the Lenaeon Victors'-list,<sup>1</sup> with unfortunate results, as will shortly appear.

It is now possible to determine to the year the duration of the synchoregia through the fortunate discovery by Wilhelm (Ber. d. Wien. Akad., Sitzung d. 4. Juli, 1906) of the original stone from which Pittakis made the strange set of notes reproduced by

<sup>1</sup> By me in A. J. P. XXI, p. 53, and elsewhere; by Wilhelm Urk. pp. 123, 125.

Köhler IG. II 971 c. and Wilhelm Urk. p. 22. The uncertain items which these two scholars were able to extract from the hopeless tangle were a poor substitute for the fragment of the great Fasti of the City Dionysia which Pittakis had seen, though the discovery of the stone itself shows that their divinatory skill was of no mean order. The fragment is of such capital importance that for the convenience of those who have not access to the original publication it is here reproduced from the reprint which I owe to the courtesy of Dr. Wilhelm; the restorations are his except the two that are queried.<sup>1</sup>

As Wilhelm shows, the relative position of the items in the three columns presupposes columns of 141 lines: following the 11 (or possibly 12)<sup>2</sup> lines of the list for 398 in col. i. we have

Col. ii.	Col. iii.
1 l. of the list for 398	6 ll. of the list for 386
132 ll. of the list for 397-387	132 ll. of the list for 385-375
8 ll. of the list for 386	3 ll. of the list for 374
<hr/> 141 lines.	<hr/> 141 lines.

Now from what is already known about the disposition of this great document on the wall on which it was inscribed (Wilhelm, Urk. p. 9 f.), the events recorded in this fragment must have been on the topmost block. And the lower margin of this block is preserved a little below the last line of col. ii. Frag. c, which has a lower and a right-hand margin, was in a corresponding position on the top block just to the left of the block containing this new fragment, d. Between c, which was in col. v of the Fasti (counting the first column of frag. a as col. i) and the first column

<sup>1</sup> Wilhelm reports in col. i l. 8 E: EXOPH. Could the first letter be Γ? If so, the choregus was Meneteles, son of Menes of Anagyrus (IG. II 1249), who was choregus for Erechtheis for a chorus of men in the early part of the fourth century. From the remains of the date-line Dittenberger Syl.<sup>1</sup> 721 proposed to restore the archon Aristocrates; but cf. Syl.<sup>2</sup> 713. The restorations precisely suit the space. So does that of Archippus in l. 10, which is tentatively proposed; see below, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> Wilhelm, in a letter of Nov. 1, 1906, kindly informed me that the N in the last line of col. ii is visible in the photograph (which he expects to publish in the next Jahresheft), and that there is "the possibility (not more than that) of some lines more in the space of 0.047 m. under the line that I thought to be the last", i. e., *Ἰασος*, etc. The first report is to be corrected accordingly. It is quite unlikely (p. 184, below) that there was another line between [κωμωιδῶ]ν and the lower margin.

## IG. II 971 d.

- [ὑποκριτῆς Νικόστρ]ατος  
 [Ἐπὶ Ἀριστοκράτου]ς 399/8  
 5. [παίδω]ν  
 [ἐχορ(ήγει)  
 [Ἐρεχθῆς ἀνδρῶν]  
 [Μενετέλης Ἀναγ (?) : ἐχορ(ήγει)  
 [κωμωιδῶν]  
 10. [Ἀρχεππος (?) ἐδίδα]σκειν  
 [ἔχ[ορήγει]  
 [Ἀρ]αῶς ἐδ[ίδα]σκ[εν]  
 τραγωιδῶ[ν]  
 Ἄρισ[τ]οκράτης Φαληρ : [ἐχορήγει]  
 Σοφοκλῆς ἐδίδασκεν  
 ὑποκριτῆς Κλέανδρο[ς]  
 Ἐπὶ Θεοδύτου 387/6  
 παλαιὸν δρᾶμα πρῶτο[ν]  
 παρεδίδαξαν οἱ τραγ[ωιδοί]  
 Ἀντιοχῆς παίδων  
 Εὐηγέτης Παλλη : ἐχο[ρήγει]  
 Αἰγῆς ἀνδρῶν  
 Ἰασος Κόλλυ : ἐχορήγ[ει]  
 [κωμωιδῶ]ν  
 [ . . . ]χος Ἄ[—ἐχορήγει]  
 [κω]μωιδῶν  
 [ . . . ]γνητο[ς—ἐχορήγει]  
 Ἄνα[ξα]νδρ[ο]ί[δης ἐδίδασκεν]  
 [τρα]γωιδῶν  
 [ . . . ]γένης [—ἐχορήγει]  
 [Σο]φοκλῆς [ἐδίδασκεν]  
 [ὑπ]οκριτ[ῆς—]  
 [Ἐπὶ Ἰ]ππο[δ]άμαντος] 375/4

of d, one column intervened. The writing in this portion of the Fasti is perfectly regular and the lines "run through" the columns, i. e., are exactly opposite each other in adjoining columns.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, since the normal number of lines in each year-list was 12, we can determine precisely what irregularities occurred in the lists during the years between 422/1, 399/8, 387/6, and 375/4, the dates preserved in the four columns of these two fragments. The addition of an extra line in any year-list will be revealed by the displacement by one line of the entries in the following columns. Using the numbers 1 to 12 to represent the usual twelve items of a year-list, we see from the following table what the last items on the top block, i. e., the items contained in the 31st line<sup>2</sup> of the columns, actually are in the four columns of c and d, what they would have been if the succession of 12-line year-lists had continued without interruption from 421 to 374, and the amount of displacement:

Column	v	vi	vii	viii	ix
Actual	421, 9th l.		398, 11th l.	386, 6th l.	374, 3d l.
Normal		409, 6th l.	397, 3d l.	386, 12th l.	374, 9th l.
Displacement			4 lines	6 lines	6 lines

The displacement of two lines between col. vii and col. viii is explained by the extra entry *παλαιὸν δράμα*, etc., in 386. That of four lines between cols. v and vii, which embrace the period of the synchoregia, must be due to this innovation, and these four extra lines were all in the year-lists contained in col. vi. While the synchoregia lasted two choregi, each with his demoticon, had to be entered in the Fasti instead of one. Both tragedy and comedy were affected by the synchoregia; the number of extra lines used was therefore bound to be an even number. For the additional two names in any year certainly two extra lines would be needed. Hence the synchoregia was maintained only two years, 406/5 and 405/4.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Schenkl in Berl. Phil. Woch. 1907, 446, is not justified in assuming that the columns varied in length between 140, 141, and 142 lines in the first part of the Fasti. His calculations regarding the number of columns lost at the beginning, so far as they assume such variation, are valueless. They perhaps prove, however, that all calculations back of 486 are a waste of time.

<sup>2</sup> Assuming, with Wilhelm, p. 21, that in c there is room for two lines (*Εὐπολὺς ἐδίδασκεν*, and *τραγωιδῶν*) between l. 13 and the lower margin, and that in d col. ii [*κωμωιδῶν*] is the last line on the block. According to this the top block contained 31 lines; Wilhelm p. 9 reckoned 32.

<sup>3</sup> Consequently, the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 need no longer be assigned to the Lenaea. That it was a City victory is shown below, pp. 187, 199.

That this result is correct can be shown by testing the possibility indicated by Wilhelm (above, p. 181, n. 2), that one or two additional lines may have intervened between [κωμωιδῶ]ν in l. 14 and the lower margin. If there were one line more the displacements would be an odd number of lines (3, 5, and 5)—an improbable supposition, for two extra names would hardly fill three lines, and four extra names could scarcely be brought into less than four lines. If there were two more lines, the displacements would be 2, 4, and 4 lines, allowing for but one year (405) of the synchoregia.<sup>1</sup> But the inscription IG. II 4, 1280 b, p. 254, records two victories for Gnathis and Anaxandrides acting conjointly as choregi, once for the poet Aristophanes and again (ἐτέρᾳ νίκῃ) for Sophocles. It is improbable that these public-spirited men assumed both a tragic and a comic choregia in the same year, and indeed somewhat surprising to learn that they accepted this liturgy in two successive years. We conclude, therefore, that Aristophanes was victorious at the City Dionysia in 405, Sophocles in 404.<sup>2</sup>

It is now clear that the metrical synchoregic inscription found at Lamptrae IG. III 1285, which formerly induced me to extend the synchoregia for comedy down to the middle of the fourth century, is to be regarded as a record of a demotic exhibition, as in fact Brinck Dis. Hal. 1886, p. 139, maintained. The union of two or more persons in the choregia at the local festivals is attested by IG. II 5, 1282, p. 254 (Icaria). The three victories of the obscure tragic poets, Dicaeogenes, Ariphron, and Polychares, IG. III 1285, with two men as choregi, is to be explained in the same way, although this inscription was found at Athens; but both choregi were Acharnians. IG. III 1282, in which three choregi from Aegilia are named, was also found at Athens, but cannot refer to the Athenian contests. The important record of the victories of Aristophanes and Sophocles was found at Eleusis, but the contents are evidently Athenian.

<sup>1</sup> The possibilities are more numerous if we assume three lines in c between l. 13 and the margin; but they are easily reckoned and do not materially affect the result.

<sup>2</sup> Wilhelm, p. 177, n. 1., assures us that the lettering of this inscription is not of the early fourth century, as reported, but is precisely like that of IG. I 338, of the year 408/7. It is entirely possible that this Sophocles was the great poet, and not his grandson, who began to exhibit his own plays in 397/6 (Diod. XIV 53. 6). In that case the Fasti probably recorded that fact of his death by τεθνηκώς. See below, p. 190.

*The Heading of the Fasti.*

It will never be possible to determine exactly the phrasing of the heading of the Fasti unless some portion of the lost part of it is discovered, although there is now essential agreement as to the principal elements which it contained. The first three extant columns contained 140 lines each, and we have just seen that cols. v, vi, vii, viii, and ix contained 141 lines. The increase of one line is doubtless to be explained by the discontinuance of the heading and the use of a portion of the space for the record. Now the actual position of the items in the frag. c, as compared with what it would have been if the first five columns had all contained 140 lines, shows a displacement of two lines. Col. iv was therefore the first one which contained 141 lines, and the heading extended over only the first three extant columns. I would suggest: οἷδε νενικήκασιν . . . ἀφ' (or ἐφ') οὗ πρῶτον κῶμοι ἦσαν τῶ[ι Διο-  
νύσῳ] Ἐλευθερεῖ.

The first items in the columns covered by the extant fragments may be given here for convenience, as showing the arrangement by columns of the whole document from frag. a to the end:

Col.	i	ii	iii	iv	v	vi	
Line	7	4	10	6	3	12	
Year	473/2	460/9	448/7	436/5	424/3	413/2	
Lines	140	140	140	141	141	141	

  

Col.	vii	viii	ix	x	xi	xii	xiii
Line	5	2	9	6	3	12	1
Year	401/0	388/7	378/7	366/5	354/3	342/1	330/9
Lines	141	141	141	141	153?	135?	?

In the lower part of col. xi the lines are crowded so as to admit probably 12 or 13 extra lines.<sup>1</sup> Col. xii may have begun with the first line of the year 341/0, leaving 154 lines to col. xi. There seems to have been a vacant space of a few lines at the end of col. xii, so that we cannot know precisely where the record ended here, nor the beginning of col. xiii.

<sup>1</sup> The crowding was apparently confined to the lowest block, for the spacing on frag. e (g Köh.), which was at the top of the third block, is normal. Wilhelm assures us (p. 241) that the upper margin observed by Köhler in e is original, and not due, as I reported, to a later use of the stone. The first line on the third block was the 70th in the column. Hence, since the top block contained 31 lines, the second contained 38.

*The Establishment of the Comic Contest at the Lenaea.*

Now that Wilhelm has proved beyond a doubt that the headings over the several sections of the Victors'-lists extended over only a single column, it becomes necessary to revise our former opinion (Introd. of Com. into City Dion., p. 25) that the comic contest was instituted at the Lenaea in the same period as at the Dionysia. We have only the evidence of the list itself (Wilhelm, p. 123) to guide us. Accepting my former view that the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 was Lenaeian and restoring his name in col. ii, l. 13, Wilhelm (p. 125) concludes that the list begins soon after the middle of the fifth century, and finds confirmation for this view in the position of the name of Eupolis in col. i. Kaibel on the other hand (p. 168) regards the notice of Anon. π. κωμ. II Kaib. concerning Pherecrates, that he won ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου 438/7 (Dobree's correction for ἐπὶ Θεάρου), as a reference to this poet's first Lenaeian victory, and thus reaches the date ca. 445 for the victory of Xenophilus, who heads the list. But Wilhelm is undoubtedly right in his contention that all notices of this kind refer to the Dionysia (see below, p. 189); nor is Dobree's correction at all certain. We have learned above that the festival at which Cephisodotus was victorious in 402 was not necessarily the Lenaea. We must no longer, therefore, use him as a starting point, but must attack the problem in a different way. It is possible, I think, to arrive at a close approximation to the truth.

We begin with the victory of Aristophanes with the Acharnians in 425; either his name or, as Wilhelm contends, that of his didascalus Callistratus, followed that of Eupolis, the ninth name. 434 is accordingly the latest possible date for the beginning of the list. The first victory of Eupolis cannot be dated later than 426; but since he began to exhibit in 429, in the same year as Phrynichus (Anon. π. κωμ. II), or in 427 (Eusebius Vers. Arm.), and both Phrynichus and Myrtilus won before Eupolis, the first victory of Eupolis is confined to 427 or 426. How many of the 20 victories of his predecessors were won before 426? The activity of Telecleides seems not to have extended beyond the period of Pericles (Meineke, Hist. crit. p. 89). The second victory of Aristomenes was won in 394, as I believe (Class. Phil. I, p. 219). We can safely assign two of Cratinus' three to this period and perhaps two of Hermippus' four. The second victories of Pherecrates and Phrynichus it would be wise to reserve for the time

after 426. This gives us about 14 victories prior to the first of Eupolis, and the year 440 or 441 as the approximate date of the first comic contest at the Lenaea. The year 442 is entirely possible, but any earlier date increasingly improbable; while 440 may safely be regarded as the lower limit.

According to Wilhelm's view (pp. 111 ff.) of the relation of the didascalus to the state, which will be discussed later on, the three names after Eupolis would be Callistratus (425), Aristophanes (424), and Philonides (422). I believe, however, that the next two were Aristophanes and Philonides (below, p. 199). Kaibel (p. 177) and Körte (Rh. Mus. LX, p. 436) propose to restore in the last line of the column Lysippus (410 or 409). What is the latest possible date indicated for this position? If we assume that all the victories of the first nine poets, except the second of Aristomenes, were won before the fifteenth poet gained his first—an extremely improbable assumption—and add the two of Aristophanes and one for each of the next three poets, we reach the year 413 or 412 (according as the list began in 441 or 440). The year 410, and the possibility of Lysippus, can be reached only by the further assumption that three or two extra victories were won before 410 by one of the unknown poets; or, to state the whole case in another way, we should be forced to assume that between Philonides (423) and Lysippus (410) only three new poets gained a place, leaving 10 years to be occupied by second or subsequent victories. The probable date indicated by the position is rather ca. 414.

The following table will exhibit the approximate chronological distribution of the names in the four columns of the Lenaeen list. It will be seen that the name of Cephisodotus can only be restored in col. ii, l. 13, on the very improbable assumption that the period ca. 414-402 was occupied by a new poet in every year but two, or else that the beginning of the list goes back some years beyond 442.

*Was the Poet or his Didascalus Victor?*

We are now prepared to discuss the question: When a poet did not himself perform the duties of didascalus in bringing out a play, was his authorship of the play officially recognized in the award, or was his representative, who was selected and doubtless paid by the poet to do this work, alone mentioned in the decision of the judges? Should we expect to find in the Fasti *Ἀριστοφάνης*

## VICTORIOUS COMIC POETS, LENAEEA.

Col. I.		Col. II.		Col. III.		Col. IV.	
442	I [Ξενόφωλος I]	411	I	379	I	339	I
441		410	II	378	II	338	II
440		409	III	377	III	337	III
439		408	IV	376	IV	336	IV
438		407	V	375	V	335	V
437	II [Τηλέκλειδης I]	406		374		334	
436	III [Αριστομένης I]	405		373		333	
435	IV Κρατίδος III	404		372		332	
434	V Φερειάρης II	403		371		331	
433	VI Ερμπατος III	402		370		330	
432		401		369		329	
431		400		368		328	
430		399		367		327	
429		398		366		326	
428	VII Φρίνυχος II	397		365		325	
427	VIII Μυρτίλος I	396		364		324	
426	IX [Εὐ]πόλις III	395		363		323	
425	X [Αριστοφάνης III] —	394		362		322	
424	Aristophanes	393		361		321	
423		392		360		320	
422	XI [Φιλωνίδης —]	391		359		319	
421		390		358		318	
420		389		357		317	
419		388		356		316	
418		387		355		315	
417		386		354		314	
416		385		353		313	
415		384		352		312	
414		383		351		311	
413		382		350		310	
412		381		349		309	
31 years	9 poets = 23	380		40 years	8 poets = 32 +	32 years	10 poets = 15 +
	6 " = 6 +				9 " = 9 +		7 " = 7 +
	Victories 29 +				Victories 41 +		Victories 22 +

ἐδίδασκεν when Callistratus had been in fact the διδασκαλος? Was Aristophanes or Callistratus named in the Victors'-lists for the victory with the Acharnians? Have we the right to assume that the formula which is attested for ca. 348 τέταρτος Ἀναξανδρίδης (play) διὰ Ἀναξίππου (IG. XIV 1098, l. 8), was employed in the official records during the period of the Old Comedy also? The question has been vigorously debated, most recently by Wilhelm Urkunden pp. 111 ff., who supports the view of Reisch and others, against that of Kaibel and others, that down to ca. 380 the actual didascalus and not the author was officially recognized; and he finds in his latest discovery (p. 182 above) a confirmation of his opinion, for in 971 d Araros is entered as victor in 387, although Suidas expressly states that he exhibited first in Ol. 101, 376-73. It would certainly seem at first glance that Wilhelm has given the right explanation of this apparent contradiction, viz., that Suidas records the date of the first exhibition of Araros with his own plays, while the victory of 387 was won by him as didascalus for his father Aristophanes. But the question at once arises, How could the source of Suidas distinguish between the author and the ὑποδιδάσκαλος? The notices of first appearances and of first victories preserved in Suidas, Diodorus, the chronographers, etc., were certainly derived from the official records of the contests at the City Dionysia, and these records, according to Wilhelm, did not mention the real author before ca. 380. Clearly the problem goes deeper. It would be well to have before us the literary evidence before we seek the solution in the inscriptional documents.

In the discussion of this subject<sup>1</sup> passages have frequently been used as evidence which in fact have no bearing on the question. We must carefully eliminate from consideration one class of instances in which plays were brought out by persons who were not their real authors, viz., 1) cases of real or alleged plagiarism, with or without the consent of the author. Here the poet who appropriated another's play desired to be known as the author, and, if he was not in fact the author, obtained his chorus under false pretenses. He of course might either bring out the play himself or employ a didascalus to represent him. There remain two classes of instances which it would be well to distinguish from each other, 2) the production of a play after the poet's death by

<sup>1</sup> Wilhelm, p. 112, refers to the principal writers on the question.

an authorized didascalus, and 3) cases like that of Aristophanes, in which the poet, desiring to be relieved of the duties of stage management, arranged with a didascalus to take charge of the production. From the point of view of the judges the principle involved in 2) is the same as in 3). If the actual didascalus in the former case was recognized in the award, we should expect him to be in the latter also, and vice versa. For convenience we will discuss 2) first, for it is not always easy to classify the other notices.

If a play was produced for the first time (i. e., not as *παλαιόν*), after the author's death, it seems that care was taken at all periods to indicate its real author as well as its didascalus. Cf. Schol. Arist. Ran. 67: διδασκαλῖαι φέρουσι, τελευτήσαντος Εὐριπίδου τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ δεδιδασθῆναι ὁμώνυμον ἐν ᾧσται Ἰφιγένειαν, etc.; Suidas s. Euripides: νίκας ἀνείλετο ιε',<sup>1</sup> τὰς μὲν ιδ' περιών, τὴν δὲ μίαν μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν, ἐπιδειξαμένου τοῦ δράματος τοῦ ἀδελφιδοῦ αὐτοῦ Εὐριπίδου; cf. also the Vita. The Didascaliae evidently reported: Εὐριπίδης πρεσβύτερος τεθνηκώς Ἰφιγενεία διὰ Εὐριπίδου; the Fasti probably gave simply Εὐριπίδης (τεθνηκώς?) ἐδίδασκεν. Victories were accorded to Aeschylus after his death: Vita, Philostr. Vit. Apoll. 6.10. Arist. Ach. 10 and Ran. 868 also alludes to the reproduction of plays in his name.<sup>2</sup> The Oedipus Coloneus was brought out (in 402) by Sophocles the grandson as didascalus, but as the dead poet's play, Hyp. O. C.: ἐπὶ τετελευτηκότι τῷ πάππῳ Σοφοκλῆς ὁ υἱοῦς ἐδίδασκεν. The victory of Sophocles in 404 recorded in the synchoregic inscription was probably a victory by the dead poet (above, p. 184, n. 2), for Diodorus XIV. 53 fin. states on didascalical authority that Sophocles, the grandson, began to exhibit plays in 396. The inference from these facts clearly is that the elder Sophocles, though dead, ἐδίδασκε διὰ Σοφοκλέους in 404 and in 402, just as two centuries afterward we find in the Didascaliae the entry (πρώτος) Παράμονος τεθνηκώς (IG. II 975, 167 B. C.). The case of Aristias probably belongs in this category, Hyp. Aesch. Sept.: δεύτερος Ἀριστίας Περσεὶ Ταντάλῳ [—] Παλαισταῖς σατυρικοῖς τοῖς τοῦ

<sup>1</sup>Codd. ε' and δ', but the cod. Vat. of the Vita and Thomas Magister give ιε', which is inherently more probable, for the former numeral. Suidas regularly records the totals for both festivals.

<sup>2</sup>There is nothing improbable in the simple statement of the Vita and of Philostratus, and the large number of victories recorded by Suidas (28) can hardly be reconciled otherwise with the number in the Vita (13, i. e., City victories); for the tragic contest at the Lenaea was not established until after his death, cf. Victors'-list rs, Wilh. p. 145. Quint. 10. 1. 66 states that later poets revised the plays of Aeschylus and won victories with them.

Πρατίνου πατρός. Though the credit for the tetralogy as a whole belonged to Aristias, the authorship of the satyr-drama was carefully recorded in the Didascaliae.<sup>1</sup>

Tragedies reproduced after the author's death—evidently an unusual honor during the fifth century—seem to have been entered in the regular contests διὰ τοῦ δεινός until the year 386. If this is true, they had the same status in the Fasti as the unexhibited plays such as the Iphigeneia or Oedipus Coloneus, and in the choregic inscriptions ἐδίδασκεν was used of the dead poet, while the Didascaliae recorded also the actual didascalus. After 386, when old tragedies were outside of the contest, the poet's name was still attached to the play, and in the Didascaliae the name of the τραγῳδός who acted as didascalus is given (II 973), though the Fasti give only οἱ τραγῳδοί. What is true of old tragedies before and after 386 is true of old comedies before and after 339.

Of an entirely different character are the instances of the first class: a poet entered in the competition as his own a play which was in fact, or according to malicious gossip, composed by another. He alone was recognized officially as the author, although he may have employed another to serve as didascalus. The state could not concern itself with charges of plagiarism which became current after the exhibition. Euphorion was officially credited with victories with plays which gossip, whose source we can readily surmise, reported to have been written by his father: τοῖς Αἰσχύλου τοῦ πατρός, οἷς μήπω ἦν ἐπιδειξάμενος, τετράκις ἐνίκησεν' ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ οἰκεία, Suidas. Arist. Ran. 78 strongly intimates that Iophon had had too much help from Sophocles. The scholiast is doubtless right in suggesting that a brilliant victory, won during his father's lifetime, was responsible for such talk. We need not rehearse such insinuations of plagiarism except to express the belief that the statements of Schol. Plat. Apol. 19 c, that Philippus, the son of Aristophanes, "contested with the plays of Eubulus", and that Araros "contested with his own and with his father's plays", do not at all mean, as Wilhelm Urk. p. 114 and Sitzungsber. p. 4 thinks, that Philippus and Araros were

<sup>1</sup>Anon. π. κωμ. II Kaib. says, under Antiphanes, τῶν κωμῳδῶν αὐτοῦ τινὰς καὶ ὁ <υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Kaib.> Στέφανος ἐδίδαξεν. Here is a possible explanation of the late date (not before 306) of the Περικλίδομένη,—slightly revised and brought out by the son after his father's death, but as his father's play. This is better than to assume a second Antiphanes with Wilhelm p. 55.

formally commissioned by Eubulus and Aristophanes respectively to act as didascali for them. The scholist's motive is clearly to retail gossip; he passes from the gibes in which Aristophanes' contemporaries indulged against him to those aimed at his sons.

The fact seems well attested that Araros, before trying his fortune with plays of his own, brought out plays written by his father, but whether openly as his father's didascalus, as Wilhelm assumes, or with intent to deceive the public into regarding him as the poet, we cannot decide without further consideration. Hyp. Plut. IV states that the Plutus was the last play brought out by Aristophanes "in his own name", and that τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ συστήσῃσι Ἀραρότα δι' αὐτῆς τοῖς θεαταῖς βουλόμενος, τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δι' ἐκείνου καθῆκαι, Κώκαλον καὶ Αἰολοσίκωνα. The Vita states the same fact and imputes the same motive, but adds that the Plutus itself was brought out δι' Ἀραρότος. Now the phrases ἐπ' ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι and διὰ τοῦ δεινός are not of themselves conclusive, as the divergent opinions of modern scholars show; they may be interpreted as meaning either the poet as opposed to his acknowledged representative, his didascalus, or the actual author as opposed to the person who was parading under false colors. If it was in fact the desire of the aged Aristophanes, who had had his fill of honors, to establish his son in the favor of the public before he died, this result was certainly best accomplished by giving him a comedy to bring out as his very own, as Sophocles was suspected of doing for Iophon. This is the idea of Anonymous when he says of Aristophanes ἔπειτα τῷ υἱῷ ἐδίδου τὰ δράματα. As didascalus for his father, on a par with Callistratus and Philonides, Araros would indeed have gained experience, but not public favor as a poet, whatever his official status as a competitor may have been. One might reasonably, therefore, on the basis of all these considerations, regard the case of Araros as like that of Iophon—that he brought out his father's plays as his own—and when we find his name entered in the Fasti as victor in 387, the year after the Plutus, the official record would seem to be entirely in accord with the literary tradition—except for the notice of Suidas above referred to.

The presence of the name of Araros, therefore, in the Fasti as victor in 387 cannot yet be regarded as settling the main question before us, viz., whether the poet or his didascalus received the official award, for he may have brought out his play either as its actual author or as his father's representative. We must accordingly look for some other evidence or leave the problem unsolved.

There is no question as to the usage in the middle of the fourth century and thereafter. Aphareus was twice victorious with the plays brought out *διὰ Διονυσίου*, Vit. X Orat. 839 c, and he is duly credited with them in the Victors'-lists. We have already (p. 189) alluded to the case of Anaxandrides. It is not likely that the tyrant Dionysius himself trained his choruses when he competed in Athens. Was the practice of the fifth century different from that of the fourth, as Wilhelm thinks? There is no *a priori* reason why it should have been. Aristophanes and his didascali are the only persons with whom we are concerned, and the Victors'-lists the only court of appeal. As we have seen (p. 188), there is a lacuna of six lines in the Lenaeon list where the names of the victors of 425—ca. 414 once stood. We shall have to depend upon the City list alone. If we find the name of Aristophanes there in a position which indicates a first victory before that of 405, we can safely conclude that the poet and not his didascalus was recognized as the competitor in the fifth as in the fourth century.

But before we consider the Dionysian Victors'-list we should not overlook the fact that the very headings that stood at the beginning of the lists of victorious poets give testimony on the point at issue: [νῆκαι] ἀστικάι (ληναικαί) ποιητῶν κωμικῶν (τραγικῶν). Does not this indicate that the persons who compiled these lists from the didascalie archives of the archons assumed that the victors were always the actual poets? All the extant fragments of the Didascalie (IG. II 973, 974, 975) except 972 also begin the yearly record with *ποηταί*. The Fasti and the choregic inscriptions give *ἐδίδασκεν*. Are we to believe, with Reisch, Pauly-Wissowa V, 405, and Wilhelm that in the fifth century *ἐδίδασκεν* indicated the actual didascalus, whether he was the real poet or not, and that the third-century compiler of the Victors'-lists ignorantly assumed the identity of didascalus and poet? It seems to me much more reasonable to assume that the official archives always gave all the pertinent facts, using the formal *ἐδίδασκεν* for the competitor, with the addition of *διὰ τοῦ δεινός* if a hypodidascalus was employed, just as, when a play by a deceased poet was brought out for the first time or reproduced as an old play, both the didascalus and the poet were mentioned. The compiler of the Victors'-lists, according to this view, had full information and entered in the category of victorious *ποηταί* only the actual poets.

*The Victors at the City Dionysia.*

In the Dionysian Victors'-list, between the names of Hermippus and Eupolis, we find the name 'Αρι-, which Kaibel (Urkunden p. 176) unhesitatingly restores as Aristophanes. Wilhelm, however, restores Aristomenes, advancing the following arguments against Kaibel, in addition to the argument that the didascalus received the prize: (1) We know of no City victory of Aristophanes of so early a date, (2) the position of 'Αρι- indicates a date ca. 430, rather before than after, (3) the names of Callistratus and Philonides can be restored in the list in positions that correspond well with the time when they were winning victories with their own and with Aristophanes' plays.

We may pass over the first argument, for we have little information about the success of the plays of Aristophanes that are not preserved; and also the third, for Callistratus and Philonides may have won victories with plays of their own, and, besides, their names do not need to be restored. But the second argument is a serious one. If the position of 'Αρι- is in fact incompatible with a first victory between 427, the year of Aristophanes' first appearance, and 424, the latest date permitted by the position of Eupolis, the justice of Wilhelm's contention must be conceded.

In my opinion Wilhelm assumes too early a date for both Pherecrates and for the fifth name in col. iii, and, therefore, for 'Αρι- also. The date 437 which he takes for Pherecrates depends upon Dobree's conjecture ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου for ἐπὶ θεάτρου in Anon. π. κωμ. This is too uncertain to depend upon. In col. iii he proposes [Ἰ]Αρχ[ι][ππος], who won a single victory in Ol. 91 (415-412) according to our text of Suidas, or [Λύσ][ι][ππος], by whom a victory was won in 410 or 409 according to IG. XIV 1097, [Λύσιππος ἐνίκα μὲν [. . . ἐπὶ Θεοπομ- or Γλαυκίπ]που. Whether it was a first victory or not depends upon the extent of the lacuna. If it was a first victory, we have seen above (p. 187) that it could hardly have been Lenaeon; the name would therefore have stood in this list somewhere in col. iii. If we can show that any position below Cephisodotus would be incompatible with a first victory won as early as 409, it would follow that at least one other victory, recorded in the lacuna of 1097, had been won by Lysippus previously to 409 and that his name must be restored in the upper part of col. ii. The interpretation of 1097 on the basis of ca. 56 letters to each line will necessarily result, according to my attempt

VICTORIOUS COMIC POETS, DIONYSIA.

COL. I.		COL. II.		COL. III.	
486	I [Χιωνίδης—]	445		406	I Νικοφῶ[ν—]
485		444		405	Aristophanes
484		443		404	II Θεόπομπ[ος—]
483		442		403	
482		441		402	III [Κη]φισό[δοτος—]
481		440		401	
480		439	I [Τηλεκλεί]δης III	400	
479		438	II [.....]ς I	399	IV [ Ἀρχ]ί[ππος I]
478		437	III — — — —	398	
477		436	IV Δ[ύσιππος II]	397	
476	II — — — —	435	V Φερ[εκράτης—]	396	
475	III — — — —	434	VI *Ερμ[ιππος II—]	395	
474	IV [.....]ς I	433		394	
473	V — — — —	432		393	
472	VI Μάγνη]ς Δ I	431		392	
471	VII [.....ο]ς I	430		391	
470	VIII *Δλκιμέ]νη]ς I	429		390	
469	IX [.....]ς I	428		389	
468		427		388	
467		426	VII *Αρι[στοφάνης II—]	387	[ Ἀραρῶς—]
466	(Poets I, II, III and V together won 14 + victories)	425	VIII Εὐπ[ολις III]	386	
465		424		385	
464		423	Cratinus	384	
463		422	Hermippus	383	
462		421	Eupolis	382	
461		420		381	
460		419		380	
459		418	IX Κα-	379	
458	X [Εὐφρόν]ιος I	417	X Φρύ[νιχος—]	378	
457		416		377	
456		415		376	[ Ἀναξανδρίδης Γ II] Anaxandrides
455	XI [Ἐκφαν]τίδης IIII	414	XI *Αμ[ειψίας—]	375	
454		413		etc.	
453		412	XII Πλά[των—]		
452	XII [Κρατῖ]νος Γ I	411	XIII Φιλ—		
451	XIII [Διοπ]εῖδης II	410			
450	XIV [Κρά]της III	409	Lysippus		
449		408	XIV Λύκ[ις—]		
448		407	XV Λεῦ[κων—]		
447					
446	XV [Καλλία]ς II				
41 years 11 poets=33		39 years 6 poets=14+			
4 " =14+		9 " =9+			
Victories 47+		Victories 23+			

in *Class. Phil.* I, p. 219, and this in turn will altogether exclude Aristomenes from the list of the City victors. The restoration of 'Αρι[στοφάνης] will follow as a natural corollary. This is the definite task before us.

The only poet in col. ii the date of whose first victory is approximately known is Eupolis; he was first in 421 (*Hyp. Pax*). Hermippus occupied 422 (*II 971 c*), Cratinus 423 (*Hyp. Nub.*). Eupolis began to exhibit in 429 (*Anon.*) or in 427 (*Hieron.*). Hermippus' victory in 422 obviously cannot have been his first. It is possible that Eupolis' victory in 421 was his first, though it is more likely to have been his second. In any event we must admit for the present the possibility that his first victory may have fallen in any of the years between 429 and 421 except 423 and 422. He won four<sup>1</sup> City victories and died before 410. Now if the victory of 421 was his first victory, and each of the ten poets following won each only one victory before the eleventh poet, hypothetically Lysippus, won his first, and if the predecessors of Eupolis won no victories at all in this interval, even so the first victory of the eleventh poet could not fall before 407 ( $421 - [11 + 3]$ ). And by assuming these extreme conditions we are forced to assign to Ameipsias an earlier victory than that of 414 (*Hyp. Av.*); this brings the date down to 406. By assigning to Eupolis 424 instead of 421 we reach 407 for the poet after Cephisodotus. To reach 409, the latest date for Lysippus, the first victory of Eupolis must be pushed back to 426. Since he first competed at the age of 17, in 429 or in 427, we have a margin of at most three years in the period 429-409 for victories by earlier poets other than the two (423, 422) already known to us.

Now it is inconceivable that for twenty years of the great period of the Old Comedy all but five of the victories were won by new poets, and that these, with the exception of Eupolis and Ameipsias, gained only one each before 409. So low an average of victories to the poet as this assumption implies can be paralleled in no other section of the Victors'-lists where the number of victories is recorded. In col. i, for example, 33 victories are recorded for 11 poets, and the four poets whose victories are broken away must have won at least 14.<sup>2</sup> But the average in col. i is of course exceptionally high.

<sup>1</sup>Suidas gives 7 as the total and 3 were Lenaeon.

<sup>2</sup>Between Chionides (486) and Cratinus (452) 20 victories are recorded for 7 poets; the other four must have won at least 14, supposing that none of the

By assigning to Eupolis the earliest and least probable date in order to make the name of Lysippus barely possible in col. iii, we are distorting the relations implied by the facts furnished by the preceding poets of the list, and are forced to assume a situation exactly the opposite of that which Körte's hypothesis would force us to assume in the Lenaeon list if Lysippus' name were to be brought into col. i there (above, p. 187). While there the interval of 15 years with four new poets had to be filled out with eleven victories by the poets before Eupolis, here the interval of 20 years with ten new poets will admit of but six victories by the earlier poets. While it cannot be maintained that either of these alternatives is impossible, both are intrinsically improbable. On general grounds it is safe to assert, I think, that the probable date implied by the position proposed for Lysippus in the City list is ca. 400, in the Lenaeon list ca. 414.

We are certainly justified, therefore, in looking for an earlier position for Lysippus in the City list. In the line above Pherecrates Wilhelm (p. 110) reports traces of the lower limbs of an A or Λ followed by the lower stroke of either P, Υ, or Φ. The position of this stroke seems to me to favor Υ or Φ rather than P (Wilhelm suggests the possibility of "Αρ- here also), and, with the preceding letter, to point, as Wilhelm observes, to ΑΥ-, 'ΑΦ-, or ΛΥ-.<sup>1</sup> A poet Autocrates, of uncertain date, is once cited (Kock I, p. 806). There is no known poet Aph-. The restoration of Lysippus here is the most probable on simply epigraphical grounds. Besides, he is thus restored to the group of poets to which he properly belongs. His predecessor in IG. XIV 1097 I believe to be Callias, his successor Aristomenes, whose name is near the head of the Lenaeon list. The chronological relations of the entire list now become intelligible and natural: Callias 446, Lysippus ca. 435, Aristophanes and Eupolis 427-424, Ameipsias 414, Cephisodotus 402. As for the date of Pherecrates' first victory, it now seems probable that Dobree's conjecture is incorrect; a later date is desirable. I would suggest ἐν Πυθοδωρῶν 431

---

predecessors of Cratinus was victorious after 452, which is extremely unlikely. Wilhelm's assertion, p. 111, that none of the predecessors of Euphronius is likely to have won the prize after 458 is obviously wrong; Ecphantides could have occupied only four years of the interval 457-452, and that only by winning four times in succession.

<sup>1</sup>It was the presence of what I took to be Λ on the stone that led to my remark *Class. Phil.* I, p. 201, n. 4. My calculations on p. 210 were inexact, since I assumed a lacuna too large by one line.

for ἐπὶ θεάτρῳ, which is about as easy palaeographically as Dobree's ἐπὶ θεοδώρῳ.

We can no longer reasonably doubt, as it seems to me, that Aristophanes won a City victory early in his career (A. J. P. XX, p. 396), as well as the City victory of 405.<sup>1</sup> Was the first victory won through the agency of a hypodidascalus or did Aristophanes act here, as in the Knights, as his own didascalus? The question cannot be answered with absolute certainty, for if the first victory of Eupolis was that of 421, the first of Aristophanes may have been won in 424. Since he himself brought out the Knights at the Lenaea of 424, he may have dispensed with a didascalus also at the Dionysia two months later. And yet this possibility is by no means a probability, as a glance at my grouping of the victors will show. It is advisable to place Aristophanes and Eupolis as high in the column as possible. Between 427, the earliest possible date for a first victory by Aristophanes, and 446, a period of 18 years, six years are occupied by the first victories of Telecleides to Hermippus. A minimum of 6 victories by the poets of col. i is carried over to col. ii and one of these was won in 423 (Cratinus). This leaves seven further victories to be accounted for, of which two could have been contributed by Telecleides and one each by Pherecrates and Hermippus and the remaining three by the poets of col. i. This is entirely reasonable, but the situation becomes increasingly difficult as the first victory of Aristophanes is given a later date. Since before the Knights he brought out no play himself but employed a didascalus, it must be regarded as all but mathematically demonstrated that the entry in the Victors'-list represents a victory won through the agency of another—'Ἀριστοφάνης ἐδίδασκεν διὰ τοῦ δεινῶς καὶ ἐνίκᾳ probably at the Dionysia of 425.

What then shall we do with the statement of Suidas that Araros first exhibited in Ol. 101, 376-373, while the Fasti record a victory by him in 386? The source of the date in Suidas was obviously the Didascaliae, and this document gave no intimation that the plays which Araros first exhibited under his own name were not composed by him. That the Cocalus and Aeolosikon were written by Aristophanes and not by Araros was known to contemporaries through current gossip or the insinuation of rival comic poets, and the Alexandrian tradition definitely ascribed

<sup>1</sup>The further argument might be employed that the fifth place in col. iii would be too late for Aristophanes' victory in 405.

these plays to the father. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be that here, as often, the numeral in Suidas has been corrupted in transmission—that for  $\rho\acute{\alpha}$  we should read  $q\eta'$ .

For the general chronological relations of the poets in the Dionysian list reference is made to the table on p. 195. For Ka—the restoration  $K\acute{\alpha}[\nu\theta\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma]$  is not improbable instead of Wilhelm's Callistratus. Plato's  $\Sigma\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\chi\iota\alpha$  was attributed by some to him, whence Meineke rightly inferred that he was a contemporary of Plato.  $\Phi\iota\lambda[\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma]$  is quite as probable as Philonides and is accepted by Kaibel; cf. the Lenaeon list. The position of the name points to a date ca. 411. We do not know whether Philonides ever won a City victory or not; but he was victor at the Lenaea in 422 with the Proagon, according to the simplest interpretation of Hyp. Vesp. [ $\nu\text{Arch}$ ] $[\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma]$ , proposed by Wilhelm as the alternative to Lysippus, is the most plausible restoration of the name following Cephisodotus on the basis of Wilhelm's report . . . | $\bar{\nu}$ , although there may have been other poets . . .  $\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma$  of whom we have no knowledge. If Archippus is to be restored the numeral in Suidas is again corrupt. His  $q\alpha'$  415-412 would have to be changed to  $q\delta'$ , 403-400;  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$  are easily confounded. We must recognize the possibility, however, that the single victory reported by Suidas may have been Lenaeon. The lacuna at the end of col. i of the Lenaeon list would admit the name of Archippus for a victory in the first years of the ninety-first Olympiad. Finally, the victory of Cephisodotus in 402 referred to in Lysias XXI, 4 may well have been his first, determining the position of this poet in the list just after Theopompus.

EDWARD CAPPS.

IV.—BOCCACCIO, *Fiammetta*, CHAP. I, AND SENECA,  
*Hippolytus*, ACT I.

That Boccaccio quotes several lines from the 'Seneca poeta', 'Seneca tragicus', whom he carefully distinguishes from Seneca the moralist, has been shown by Hortis (*Studj Sulle Opere Latine del Boccaccio*, p. 405). Among the tragedies, the *Hippolytus* (*Phaedra*) was one of his favorites: from it he quotes three times in the *De Genealogia Deorum* (4. 10; 9. 4 (Hortis wrongly has 16); 10. 50), and once in the *Commentary on Dante* (Lez. 20: ed. Milanesi 1. 480). Twice (*Gen. Deor.* 9. 4; *Com.*, as above) he quotes from the chorus at the end of Act I (*Hipp.* 293-301). In the *Genealogia*, the quotation occurs in a chapter devoted to Cupid; in the *Commentary* it forms part of a discussion on the nature of love, based upon *Inf.* 5. 100, in the story of Paolo and Francesca; the two contexts having much in common.

In view of these facts, it is not surprising that Boccaccio has drawn upon the *Hippolytus* for one of his Italian works. In the first chapter of the *Fiammetta*, Venus appears to the heroine to overcome the scruples awakened by the nurse, and it is here that Boccaccio has imitated a large part of the chorus mentioned above, including the lines which he elsewhere quotes twice; besides, he is clearly indebted to certain verses of the last long speech of *Phaedra* in the preceding scene (177-194). To facilitate comparison, I have subjoined to each Italian passage the corresponding Senecan lines. The order is that of the Italian, it being understood that these passages are not continuous in the Italian, but are connected by expansions of the thought, and variations on the topics introduced. Thus, after the illustration from Jupiter (V, below), Boccaccio adds: 'Quello che per Semele nella propria forma facesse; quello che per Alcmena mutato in Anfitrione; quello che per Calisto mutato in Diana, o per Danae divenuto oro già fece, non diciamo, che sarebbe troppo lungo.' In such cases, as in the extract just quoted, he seems to owe much to Ovid.

In the first quotation below, the mention of the Ganges is evidently due to Dante (*Purg.* 2. 5; 27. 4 *Par.* 11. 51; later

imitators are Politian 2. 38; Ariosto, *Orl. Fur.* 19. 106; Tasso 1. *Canz.* 4.).

The Italian quotations are given from Moutier's text (*Opere Volgari di Giovanni Boccaccio* 6. 22-25), the Latin ones from Leo's edition<sup>1</sup> (with occasional change of punctuation).

## I.

'Quantunque Febo surgente co' chiari raggi di Gange insino all' ora che nell' onde d'Esperia<sup>2</sup> si tuffa colli lassi carri, alle sue fatiche dare requie, vede nel chiaro giorno; e ciò che tra 'l freddo arturo e 'l rovente polo si chiude, signoreggia il nostro volante figliuolo senza alcuno niego.'

Hipp. 285-290:

Quaeque nascentem videt ora solem,  
Quaeque ad Hesperias iacet ora metas,  
Si qua ferventi subiecta Cancro,  
Si qua Parrhasiae glacialis Ursae  
Semper errantes patitur colonos,  
Novit hos aestus.

## II.

'Egli commuove le ferocissime fiamme de' giovani, e negli stanchi vecchi richiama gli spenti calori, e con non conosciuto fuoco delle vergini infiamma i casti petti.'

Hipp. 290-3:

Iuvenum feroces  
Concitat flammas, senibusque fessis  
Rursus extinctos revocat calores;  
Virginum ignoto ferit igne pectus.

## III.

'Questi colle sue fiaccole riscaldati gl' Iddii, comandò per addietro che essi, lasciati i cieli, con falsi visi abitassono le terre.'

Hipp. 294-5:

Et iubet caelo superos relicto  
Vultibus falsis habitare terras.

## IV.

'Or non fu Febo . . . più volte da costui soggiogato? . . . Certo sì; e ultimamente rinchiusa la sua gran luce sotto la vile

<sup>1</sup> The vulgate editions, with their interpolated text (cf. Leo, pp. 1 ff.), sometimes resemble Boccaccio more closely.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Ovid, *F.* 2. 73.

forma d'un picciolo pastore, innamorato guardò gli armenti d'Ameto.'

Hipp. 296-8:

Thessali Phoebus pecoris magister  
Egit armentum, positoque plectro  
Impari tauros calamo vocavit.

Cf. Hipp. 192-3:

Ipsumque Phoebum, tela qui nervo regit,  
Figit sagitta certior missa puer.

### V.

'Giove medesimo, il quale regge il cielo, costringendolo costui si vestì minor forma di sè: egli alcuna volta in forma di candido uccello movendo l'ali diè voci più dolci che il moriente cigno, e altra volta divenuto giovenco, e poste alla sua fronte corna, muggiò per li campi, e li suoi dossi umiliò alli gioghi virginei, e per li fraterni regni, colle fesse unghie imitando ufficio di remo, con forte petto vietando il profondo, godè della sua rapina'.

Hipp. 299-308:

Induit formas quoties minores  
Ipse qui caelum nebulasque fecit:<sup>1</sup>  
Candidas ales modo movit alas,  
Dulcior vocem moriente cygnoi  
Fronte nunc torva petulans iuvenus  
Virginum stravit sua terga ludo,  
Perque fraternos, nova regna, fluctus,  
Ungula lentos imitante remos,  
Pectore adverso domuit profundum,  
Pro sua vector timidus rapina.

Cf. Hipp. 186-7:

Hic volucer omni pollet in terra impotens,<sup>2</sup>  
Laesumque flammis torret indomitis Iovem.

### VI.

'E il fiero Iddio dell' armi, la cui rossezza ancora spaventa i giganti, sotto la sua potenza temperò i suoi aspri effetti, e divenne amante'.

Hipp. 188:

Gradivus istas belliger sensit faces.

<sup>1</sup> Vulg. ducit.

<sup>2</sup> Heins. potens.

## VII.

'E il costumato al fuoco fabbro di Giove, e facitore delle trisulche folgori, da quelle di costui più possenti fu tocco.'

Hipp. 189-191:

Opifex trisulci fulminis sensit deus,  
Et qui furentes semper Aetnaeis iugis  
Versat caminos igne tam parvo calet.

## VIII.

'Rimirisi primamente al fortissimo figliuolo d'Alcmena, il quale, poste giù le saette e la minaccevole pelle del gran leone, sostenne d'acconciarsi alle dita i verdi smeraldi, e di dar legge ai rozzi capelli, e con quella mano colla quale poco innanzi portata avea la dura mazza . . . trasse le fila della lana data da Iole dietro al pendente fuso; e gli omeri sopra i quali l'alto cielo s'era passato . . . furono . . . coperti . . . di sottili vestimenti di porpora.'

Hipp. 317-320, 323-4, 327-9:

Natus Alcmena posuit pharetras,  
Et minax vasti spolium leonis,  
Passus aptari digitis smaragdos,  
Et dari legem rudibus capillis. . .  
Et manu, clavam modo qua gerebat  
Fila deduxit properante fuso. . .  
Umerisque quibus sederat alti  
Regia caeli tenuem Tyrio  
Stamine pallam.

## VIII.

'Santo e questo fuoco è molto potente, credimi. . . Per costui la tortola il suo maschio seguita, e le nostre colombe ai suoi colombi vanno dietro con caldissima affezione, nè nessuno altro n'è che dalla maniera di questi fugga alcuna volta; e ne' boschi i timidi cervi, fatti fra sè feroci quando costui gli tocca, per le disiderate cervie combattendo e mugghiando<sup>1</sup> delli costui caldi mostrano segnali. E i pessimi cinghiari, divenendo per ardore spumosi, aguzzano gli eburnei denti; e i leoni africani, da amore tocchi,<sup>2</sup> vibrano i colli'.

Hipp. 330-1, 339-342, 345-350:

Sacer est ignis (credite laesis)  
Nimiumque potens. . .

<sup>1</sup> The position of this clause shows that Boccaccio is following the vulgate, which places after *cervi* the line and a half now following *leones*.

<sup>2</sup> Boccaccio evidently construes 'cum movit amor' with what precedes.

Venere instinctus suscipit audax  
 Grege pro toto bella iuventus;  
 Si coniugio timuere suo,  
 Poscunt timidi proelia cervi.  
 . . . . . Tunc vulnificos  
 Acuit dentes aper, et toto est  
 Spumeus ore;  
 Poeni quatiunt colla leones,  
 Et mugitu dant concepti  
 Signa furoris: cum movit amor,  
 Tum silva gemit murmure saevo.

## IX.

'I dardi del nostro figliuolo ancora nelle fredde acque sentono le greggi dei marini Iddii e de' correnti fiumi. Nè crediamo che occulto ti sia quale testimonianza già Nettuno, Glauco, e Alfeo, e altri assai, n'abbiano renduta, non potendo colle loro umide acque, non che spegnere, ma solamente alleviare la costui fiamma.'

Hipp. 331-8:

Qua terra salo  
 Cingitur alto, quaque per ipsum  
 Candida mundum sidera currunt,  
 Haec regna tenet puer immitis,  
 Spicula cuius sentit in imis  
 Pervius undis rex<sup>1</sup> Nereidum,  
 Flammamque nequit relevare mari.

## X.

'Ogni cosa alla Natura soggiace, e da lei niuna potenza è libera, ed essa medesima è sotto Amore'.

Hipp. 352-3:

Vindicat omnem  
 Sibi naturam; nihil immune est.

## XI.

'Quando costui il comanda, gli antichi odii periscono, e le vecchie ire e le novelle danno luogo alli suoi fuochi; e ultimamente tanto si stende il suo potere che alcuna volta le matrigne fa graziose a' figliastri, che è non piccola maraviglia.'

Hipp. 354-7:

Odiumque perit cum iussit Amor;  
 Veteres cedunt ignibus irae.  
 Quid plura canam? vincit saevas  
 Cura novercas.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

ALBERT S. COOK.

<sup>1</sup> The vulgate reading, *grex*, perhaps appears in Boccaccio's *greggi* (cf. Leo, p. 2).

## NOTE.

### PLAUTINA.

There are in Plautus many plays on words, some of which it may be impossible to discover; but some seem hardly to have been detected. The following from that amusing play the *Pseudolus* may prove of some interest.

Act I, Scene I 33 (36). Calidorus is in love with a lady, Phoenicium: She has written him a love-letter, which he asks his confidential slave Pseudolus to read. The confidential slave, who was intending to get his master out of a scrape, liked to indulge in a little preliminary banter, not always of the most refined kind. So, in this case, he says to his young master, "I see your lady love." "Where?" says Calidorus. Ps. *Eccam in tabellis porrectam: in cera cubat*. This of course means in the first place "there she is on the wax tablets: she is couched in wax": but Plautus must also have meant, "She is lying stretched out on boards: she is lying *on her face*". Such authorities as Körting assert that there is no Latin word known which can be proved to be the origin of *chiere*, but he assumes a word *\*cara*; but it seems that in this case we have the very word wanted. It is evident that Calidorus must have understood that Pseudolus had said something very insulting, which he strongly resents: and if this interpretation of the passage is right, the word '*cera*' will stand as the origin of our word '*cheer*', and as a by-form of *\*cara*.

Act I, Scene I 84, 85 (88). Ca. *Restim volo mihi emere*. Ps. *Quam ob rem?* Ca. *Qui me faciam pensilem*. "I want a rope". "Why?" "That I may hang myself". This is the obvious meaning, but the words imply also "to make myself solvent. The construction with '*facere*' puts us in mind of the French use of '*faire*'.

Act I, Scene II 26 (158). Ballio loquitur. *Te cum securi, caudicali praefficio provinciae*. Ballio says to the Lorarius, I set you in charge of the 'wooden province': i. e. to chop wood. But as *caudex* also means a blockhead, the Lorarius answers as if

he had said, "the province of blockheads". "But that is dull referring to the axe; and "that is dull" referring to the wits of the provincials who are called 'caudicales'; though the latter word is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον."

Act II, Scene II 33 (629). Harpax says to Pseudolus "If you were to be the custodian of the treasurer of Jove I would never trust you with a copper. Pseudolus replies Dum tu strenuas, (al. dum tu sternuas) res erit soluta. In 'strenuas' may there be a cynical allusion to 'strenae' which P insinuates is the last thing that he expects from that quarter, 'the matter will be settled': the words also mean 'the money will be paid', and 'the object will be freed'. In line 45 there is another pun on solutum. 'It will be a looser transaction' and 'more will be paid'.

The reading 'strenuas' is, however, superseded in the latest editions of Plautus by 'sternuas' as collated from the Ambrosian palimpsest by Studemund, and rendered accessible to the world by the edition published after his death by his friend Seyffert. This work is commonly and rightly regarded as the most authoritative of existing collections. (See Sonnenschein's 'Rudens', p. xvii).

The authority of the Palatine MS cannot be held to be paramount as against the palimpsest unless the reading in the latter were unintelligible or plainly erroneous. In the case before us it seems that the maxim "difficilior lectio est potior" seems at first sight to apply to the reading of the palimpsest, but that a little consideration will shew it to be more probable, more Latin, more Plautine. I believe the meaning to be "If you only sneeze, the obstacle will be cleared away—the words res erit soluta will likewise mean 'the money will be paid': an expression à double entente, more Plautine. I believe that Pseudolus means 'If you could only clear your head you would see it was best to pay over the money at once'. 'Sternutamenta' were thought to clear the head, and mustard is recommended to produce sneezing (cf. Plin. N. H. XX. 87. 2. Cf. also Celsus VIII. 1) sub his enim crustae resolvuntur, quae tum per sternutamenta elidi debent. The syntax of the words seems against taking them in the sense of 'The money shall be paid as quickly as you sneeze'.

Act III, Scene II 1 (790). Forum coquinum qui vocant stulte vocant; nam non coquinum est, verum furinum est forum. Does not this line suggest that 'coquin' in French may come from 'cocus' and not, as commonly assumed, from coq? It is

evident that Ballio means to speak of the Forum as a haunt of *rascals*, and I take the meaning of coquinum here to be 'rascally'.

In Captivi IV III, 7 ius dicam larido seems to be a pun on *ius*. I'll dictate the sauce for the bacon; and in line 8 et quae *pendent* indemnatae pernae a reference to such expressions as 'pendente lite'.

H. A. STRONG.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Pour mieux connaître Homère. Par MICHEL BRÉAL, Paris, Hachette, 1906.

In M. Bréal's 'Pour mieux connaître Homère' the reader will recognize the various articles he has written for the 'Revue de Paris' on the subject of Homer and the Homeric Question, and not a few of the etymologies that he has published elsewhere from time to time. The first part of the volume is given up to Homer and the Homeric Question, the second is a Lexilogus. The book is alive with cleverness and it was this cleverness that seduced me into making a summary of the first chapter 'Un problème de l'histoire littéraire' (A. J. P. XXIV 353), a non-committal abstract in which I tried to be as fair as possible; and the readers of the Journal may recall my statement of M. Bréal's main contentions. To him the Homeric epos is an epopee. It is a supreme work of art, not an evolution, not an exhalation, and it is to be judged as more recent epopees are to be judged. 'Parmi les épopées des différents âges, des différents peuples, l'Iliade est la première et la plus belle : mais elle n'est pas d'une autre espèce'. Now, as I frankly said in my review of M. Terret's Homère (A. J. P. XX 90) for a first acquaintance with Homer, I am on the side of the Unitarians. To know Homer better is to get into the Homeric swing, and nowadays schoolboys read three books, six books, at most twelve books. Why disillusion them in advance, as is regularly done at the beginning of each book? Why vilipend the Eighth Book of the Iliad with its famous close? Why consider Kalypso a feeble replica of Kirke, or the flirtatious Penelope a graft on the true heroine? Every right-minded Homerist resents the reflection that the Agamemnon of Stephen Phillips's Ulysses casts on the consort of the much-enduring, and wonders how he dares to contradict the Agamemnon of the Νέκυια; and it is not consonant with the reverence due the wife of Odysseus to rake up the scandals of her early married life or to quote Ovid's malicious version of the Trial of the Bow:

Qui latus argueret, corneus arcus erat.

But even a touch of the *esprit gaulois* were better than dead-alive interpretation or perpetual dissection, and while M. Bréal is by no means a Unitarian, still, as we have seen, he tries to save large stretches of the Iliad, which no one can keep from admiring, though we are solemnly told by the commentators that they are so many *dulcissima vitia*. But no matter what the theory may

be, French perspicuity and French point are more than welcome in this range of studies. In a domain that the Germans have made peculiarly their own for more than a century, a foreign voice is actually a relief, and M. Bréal's patriotism is a welcome note. He has a good word to say for Madame Dacier's conception of Homeric characters (A. J. P. XXIV 355), and in this volume he tries to annex Buttmann. The ancestral Buttmann, it appears, was a French Boudemont and the great grammarian and lexilogist had a bloodright to the Gallic clearness and brightness that distinguish him in his writings as they distinguished him, I believe, in social intercourse. Fortunately for some of us, *la voix du sang* may also serve as an excuse when it becomes frivolously vocal in a later generation. M. Bréal himself, needless to say, stands for a certain lightness and airiness in the treatment of Homeric problems, and as there are some who seem to think that the sunshine of Homer has caused too many readers to overlook the sombreness of the background, the 'Melancholy of the Greeks' (A. J. P. XII 521), who could not have been so joyous, if they had not been so sad, so M. Bréal, on the other hand, in spite of all that has been written about the wit and humor of Homer, seems to think that the gay, not to say frivolous, side has been too much neglected. <One must know the face of Homer well to catch his dimpling smile, and commentators are prone to chase elusive protasis and apodosis in Homer's feminine syntax, which is intended to be feminine syntax (Il. 14, 331-6) and fail to sympathize with the returning hero when he lies to Penelope, as if he had been a modern traveller, recounting his exploits to his wife. At any rate the redactor, who wrote—we can say 'wrote' now—ὡς πρῶτον Κίκονας δάμασ' was as genuine a humorist as Mr. Dooley.>

I cannot undertake to summarize the rest of the volume on the same scale as my résumé of the first chapter, but the subject is one of perennial interest, and I hope the eminent author will forgive my parenthetical remarks and illustrations. The reader will readily pull out the coarse basting-threads of my adaptations even where I have not clearly indicated them.

What is the *Iliad*? asks M. Bréal in the chapter following the one already summarized. Not a gigantic game of patience played by a commission under Peisistratos, not a collection of popular ballads. For what has popular poetry to do with a composition that presents the triple character of a consecutive story, a uniform language, an invariable metre? No. The famous commission had to deal with manuscripts, with rolls of papyrus such as we have in our museums, not written for general circulation but an archetype, possessed by a community, stored up for the celebration of some great solemnity, stored up and augmented from time to time; and such was the use to which it was put at the Panathenaia. The *Iliad* is a collective work—nearly to the same degree and in the same sense

as our mediaeval cathedrals. There have been additions to the original stock. But as the language and the prosody are kept up without great change for centuries, how can we distinguish the new matter? Not in those elements in which divergence is sedulously avoided, but in unconscious anachronisms. Single combats, comparable to the duels of the paladins of the Middle Ages, are followed by the movements of armies. The heroes are transformed. They have the same names, sport the same epithets but they are no longer the same. Once demigods, they have become mortal; once paladins, they have become generals. They have armies to command. Their soldiers are drilled, march in rank and file; bivouac in order, attack in column. Fines await the delinquents and surgeons attend the wounded. These anachronisms run through the entire poem; they are not massed at the end. The state is organized. The momentous word *πόλις* is pronounced. There is a senate, an assembly of the people. There are orators in Homer, men who have made reputations as public speakers; and these speeches have a more modern cast than the rest of the poems because the poet had no model as he had for the narrative. The same dualism shews itself in the portions that pertain to the divine. The Iliad might be expected to take its gods seriously; but the gods are, as a rule, far inferior to men in morality. Kronos is a crooked soul, Apollo a traitor, Athene a cheat. Helen has a better character than her mistress, Aphrodite. The moral code for mortals is not very exalted, according to M. Bréal, who evidently scorns Horace's dictum as to Homer's ethical doctrines. It is a rather *terre à terre* morality but it will serve. The discrepancy becomes flagrant when the two conceptions meet in the same personage, as in the case of Zeus, the Zeus who is the supreme god of the Indo-European races, all-powerful, just, the enemy of falsehood, the helper of the weak and the unhappy, and Zeus the capricious and feeble despot, the malicious breed-bate, the peevish, fretful monarch, tricked by his wife and over-persuaded by his old flame, Thetis, whom M. Bréal by an odd lapse calls his daughter. The Iliad unites and confounds the two images, that of the Aryan deity and the Zeus of the poems of adventure that have preceded the Iliad.

In a recent number of the new Greek periodical 'Η Μελέτη Mr. Tsountas discusses the question when the Greeks began to wash their hands and faces the first thing in the morning, and considers his Homeric ancestors half-civilized because the early ablution was to them a religious rite and not a regular function of the daily toilet. 'Half-civilized' is not the word that M. Bréal would suffer to be used in connection with Homer. The time of the Iliad is a time of wealth and luxury, as is attested by the poem itself, and M. Bréal rejects, as we have seen, the usual explanation that all such proof-texts are later additaments (A. J. P. XXIV 355). He has evidently no sympathy with the seductive

method of Robert (A. J. P. XXII 467). The ignorance of geography, scandalous ignorance, shewn in some parts is offset by the exact details of other parts. Homer's knowledge of such subjects is like that of Vergil and Dante, now precise and true <let us say, as precise and true as M. Bérard would have us to believe> now confused and fantastic, <let us say, as Pindar's, P. 4, 201>. Everything depends on the source of information; and the haziness of American geography in European eyes is proverbial. I have just read an English novel in which Colorado figures as a town. One thing is certain, we are in no rudimentary world. <Homer is discreetly silent as to his own time. The sigh οἱοί νῦν βροτοί εἰσιν is mere sentimentality, but as man makes God in his own image> the constitution of Olympus may help us, and the Olympian court is modelled on an Asiatic original, and that Oriental monarchy is the Lydian. <Lydia, I am glad to see, has been coming to its rights again, for the world was growing just a little weary of the Hittites when the great ghost of Kroisos rose again in the verse of Bakchylides.—To be sure, the Hittites have had a revival since M. Bréal's book was published.—Lydia was in a sense the France of Greece. When we read Archilochos, when we read Sappho, we feel both the shadow and the light of Lydia.> Be that as it may, the society of the Iliad is a feudal society, made up of semi-independent chiefs, princes and lords of high degree, determined genealogists, claimants of divine descent. <As everybody is honorable to a Japanese> so Alexandros is 'divine' to Menelaos. As for the idyllic scenes of the poems, as for Nausikaa, the divine washerwoman and Odysseus, the divine joiner—well, in every age and in every country the eclogue is a product of over-civilization, and M. Bréal refuses to take Nausikaa on the seashore any more seriously than history takes Marie Antoinette at the Trianon. Achilles prepares a meal with the help of his companion Patroklos. But this is regarded by M. Bréal as a trait of a legendary past. Else he thinks we should not have had the scene, <which recalls King Alfred and the cakes, Marion and the potatoes, as well as Abraham and his angelic visitor. And yet it may be asked: Are there no beefsteak clubs now in luxurious America, no oyster roasts, no terrapin stews, no chafing-dish suppers from which professionals are excluded?> The Homeric world is a refined world, and M. Bréal repeats with approval the observation that in forty-eight cantos there is no low idea, no coarse word.

Of this Homeric refinement one illustration has recently crossed the track of my studies. Among my many schemes is or was a collection of translations of the story of Eumaios in the Odyssey. The Lay of the Swineherd seems to me the handiest episode in the two poems for the illustration of the different methods of translating Homer in different periods, in different nationalities and incidentally for the demolition of the ballad business, which hardly needs demolishing now. Essential to my catena was the

version in Latin hexameters by the XVIth century scholar, Simon Lemnius, and after a long time I succeeded in getting a copy through the kindness of my friend and colleague, Professor Kirby Flower Smith, who transcribed the episode with his own hand. In this story the princeling's nurse falls a victim to the smooth tongue of a Phoenician trader as she was washing clothes by the seaside. I need not go through the long list of seductive and seduced washerwomen; the situation is familiar to every student of literature. It was doubtless familiar to Homer. The daughter of Arybas was, perhaps, as nobly born as Nausikaa. Whether she had a worse fate or not depends on one's conception of the character of Telemachos. The language is the conventional language of the epos and there is no harm, no real indelicacy in *μίγη . . . εὐνῇ καὶ φιλότῃτι*. *μίγη* has a very different stamp from the English 'mix', and I have suggested a number of renderings for it in Pindar as also for *κεράννυμι*, to the displeasure of Dr. Fennell (O. 1, 22). To be sure, there is a moral reflexion on the bad effects of such an amour on a working-woman, but the thought is quite in keeping with the homely strain of Eumaios. But when we turn to our modern scholar we find that he has drawn on his Horatian vocabulary for one of the coarsest words in the Latin language to express the harmless *εἰμίσγετο λάθρῃ*; and was not mindful of the *οὐδὲ ζοικε* which M. Bréal emphasizes as the mark of the conventionality of the Homeric world. 'Es ziemt sich nicht!' as a German 'Hofdame' would say.

One would fain place, says M. Bréal, this flowering of politeness and poetry in one of the Greek colonies of Ionia. History tells us of commercial republics that could hold their own with the most elegant courts. But the cast of the poem is monarchical, and in the King of the Phaeacians and his 'incomparable wife', we have an idealized portrait of royalty. That is M. Bréal's impression. <Another impression, for which something might be said, puts the whole Phaeacian episode in the realm of what used to be called 'genteel comedy'. The emptiness of Alkinoos is as conspicuous as his good manners. One can imagine an irreverent but kindly American giving an account of the court life of a small German principality in the good old days. Needless to say, such a *motif* is quite alive in the fiction of to-day.> But M. Bréal clings to the idea of a Greek poet living at the Lydian court, which, we know, was haunted by Greek adventurers, a poet who was a sound monarchist—*οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίῃ*—and yet true to the memories of his own country, the home of his poetical creations—*εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης*. <I wish M. Bréal had commented on the professorial exchange, which brought Alkman from Lydia to Sparta. Nothing could have been more twentieth century.>

The events of the Greek epopee, continues M. Bréal, belong to mythology but it is a mythology that has gone through a chemical process of purification. It is, as far as possible, reasonable and human. Grant the intervention of the gods, and all the action

follows the laws of logic. There are traces of the old 'zoological mythology' but they are faint and far away. The hardworking gods of popular invention would be astonished at the *ῥαία ζῶοντες* of Homer. There is no Saturnus to protect the seed, no Ceres to watch the growth of the crops, though we have a number of Usener's transparent gods (A. J. P. XVII 358), Justice (Θέμις), Supplications (Λιταί), Graces (Χάριτες), Discord (Ἔρις). True, there are remnants of a crude age, but we must not lay too much stress on the death of Iphigeneia, on the immolation of the twelve young Trojans by Achilles. The moral standard had risen above the cult. The opposition between Agamemnon and Kalchas typifies the conflict, <shall we say, between intellect and faith?> More twentieth century.

Theoretical evolutionists of the epos, continues M. Bréal, love to connect it with a great historical event, but this is true only of the learned epos (*l'épopée savante*). Vergil makes Turnus the representative of the old indigenous populations of Italy. Tasso sings the victory of Christendom over the infidels. The Chanson de Roland has already passed out of the first phase in which the army of Rama makes war on Hanuman, King of the Apes, and the Finns go forth for the conquest of 'sampo'—'a metallic object not yet determined' <how different from 'La secchia rapita' of Tassoni.> With his view of the Iliad M. Bréal is willing enough to concede that there is something true in the familiar hypothesis that the Iliad has for its subject the struggle between two civilizations, but he thinks that the Asiatic origin of the Iliad makes the matter obscure.

But the date? Well may M. Bréal say that he feels the danger of a date. The time at which he puts what he is careful to call 'l'ensemble des oeuvres placées sous le nom d'Homère' is the time of the last kings of Lydia, of Alyattes, or Croesus himself. The Herodotean date he waves away. It is a personal opinion that amounts to nothing, in view of the way in which the historian was fooled by spurious inscriptions. One shivers at the audacity of M. Bréal, but it is not a *nouveau frisson* when one remembers Paley, who brings the redactor of Homer into the historical blaze of the fifth century. Herodotos thus disposed of, M. Bréal declines to linger on the popular theme of Mycenaean antiquities. The Mycenaean antiquities existed for Homer as they exist for us—only better preserved. The poet could not ignore them. He had to stage his heroes in that ancient setting. 'Hero', according to M. Bréal, means 'ancestor', literally, the 'early one', from the radical we find in *ἔαρ* and *ἡριγένεια*, and these 'early birds' were decked out in a plumage that M. Bréal parallels with the Scottish kilt.

As to the personality of the poet M. Bréal has nothing more to say except that one of the *αἰδοί*, who bore the name, achieved a certain popularity and effaced the others. In any case he was not the only one. The name sums up an epoch. But all the pro-

ductivity of that epoch was not confined to the epos, and the hexameter was not the only artistic form. It is as if the Louvre had disappeared with all its pictures except one room.

The language of Homer is the subject of the fifth chapter. It is neither pure Ionic nor Aeolic nor Boeotian nor Cypriote. It is not, as Otfried Müller said, a precious and fine web that has been torn to pieces and mended at haphazard. The web was spun and woven in the heads of the rhapsodes. According to M. Bréal a perfectly pure language is a chimaera of the schools to be distrusted everywhere, how much more in poems that have been produced under circumstances favorable to a composite language (A. J. P. XXIV 357). We have not to do with a primitive population and a meagre vocabulary. We have in the Iliad and Odyssey the richest thesaurus ever presented to the service of poetry with a wealth of synonyms and an extraordinary variety of inflexions; and yet these inflexions are all authentic, all justified by inscriptions, by etymological analysis, by comparison with sister languages. The singers are heirs of a long tradition; their memories are stored with verses and hemistichs (A. J. P. VI 399). They are familiar with all the keys of their instrument. See what they have made of that arid theme, the catalogue of the ships. They play so readily with the hexameter that they are often carried beyond their theme for the mere fun of the thing. <We can say of them as was said of Ovid: *nimium amatores ingenii sui*.> 'To reduce them to the paradigms of a rigid grammar, to an inflexible phonetic, would be to misunderstand these gifted singers, their age, their environment'. M. Bréal refuses to follow the lead of those who see in the history of Smyrna, an Aeolic colony afterwards conquered by the Ionians, the secret of this mixed language, nor does he attribute the absence of certain forms, Doric forms, to a feeling of antipathy. The language is regulated as it is later by the order of literature. Of course, M. Bréal admits the fascination of the transfer of the Homeric poems to the supposed original Aeolic (A. J. P. VII 232), but it is just the fascination of the linguist's daily work, his daily teaching; and the popularity of the poems in their Ionic garb in every part of Greece, whether Aeolian or Dorian, seems to him conclusive against the hypothesis of a deliberate transfer from one dialect to another <and he does not stop to recognize the muffled hostility of Pindar (A. J. P. XXVII 484)>. Similar mixtures, similar doublets abound in every language. Only in many instances the irregularities are disguised by a rigid orthography, whereas the Homeric spelling is phonographic. As to the evidence drawn from the existence of very old forms such as the genitive in *-οιο* side by side with the genitive in *-ου*, that proves nothing as to the long duration of the period of elaboration. Even in our modern idioms, consecrated and fixed by writing, there are variants quite as startling as *ἡμεῖς* and *ἄμμες*, *εἵνεκα* and *ἐνεκα*, *μέμνησαι*, *μέμνηαι* and *μέμνηη*. The mixture of the ancient and the modern is no proof of the length of time necessary

for the elaboration of these poems, for we are not dealing with popular poetry, and in no period, among no people, have poets been denied the privilege of reproducing old formulas, either for the verse's sake or to give their language more weight, more color. Inflections do not disappear at once. They are preserved in ritual and in law. <The old *-th* was still used by our grandfathers when they wished to be impressive. Nothing can be deader than *-st*, than *thou*, than *ye*, and yet they still have a use in certain spheres. In fact *thou* is so dead that the phonetists of to-day are quarrelling about the pronunciation. The Friends say *thee* (A. J. P. IV 285)>.

It is true, continues M. Bréal, that the Homeric language has its own grammar and its own lexicon, but no essential feature differentiates it from the following period. What Classic Greek has lost, is already lost in Homeric Greek, e. g. the ablative. What Classic Greek has acquired, has been acquired in Homeric Greek, e. g. the aorist λύσας, τύψας, and the conditional particle ἂν. Homer has very nearly the same wealth of suffixes as the ages that followed. There is no lack of abstracts. The *-σύνη* forms are distinctly conspicuous, and the process of 'concretion' which M. Bréal in his *Sémantique* calls 'épaississement' is there. ἵπποσύνη is 'riding' (*équitation*), but in λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων we have to do with 'rides' (*chevauchées*). <But the whole subject of abstracts is a large one from which I must turn resolutely, lest I be betrayed into divagations on the silences of Homer (A. J. P. XXIV 353)>.

Of course, no one can write about Homer without touching on the *epitheta ornantia*, which constitute so marked a feature of the Homeric poems. They remind M. Bréal of 'le brave Dunois' and 'le grand Corneille'. A great resource were they for the rhapsode, as is sufficiently obvious. They were welcome tags. But M. Bréal goes on to say that they were not only a resource for the rhapsode, they were a rest for the hearer. This is the reason why fifty verses of the *Iliad* are easier to read than twenty of the *Aeneid*. These *epitheta ornantia* are real lubricants of discourse. They are found not only in the descriptions but in the speeches. Agamemnon does not omit them in his wrath nor Dolon in his terror.

Another mark of an advanced art of composition is the use of comparisons which M. Bréal considers as quite opposed to the spirit of popular poetry—another large subject about which much might be said (A. J. P. II 108)—and there is finally the comic note, which he fancies has not been sufficiently elaborated on account of the respect inspired by the epic genus. His chief sample is Nestor, <and no wonder, for in the case of Nestor, Homer has sacrificed the interest of his hearers to the truthfulness of dramatic representation. οὐχ ἔδος ἐστί, γεραίε διοτρεφές, says Patroklos (Il. 11, 647), and we all sympathize with him, but the Γερήμιος ἱππότα jogs on the footpath way, regardless of his impatient hearer.> As to the composition of the *Iliad*, criticism has ceased

to admit that an epopee can spring entire from popular inspiration. The difficulty is to reconcile spontaneous origin with artistic elaboration. According to the prevalent view, the material is furnished by a number of lays on the same subject, called forth by some great event, rising spontaneously at different points, spreading and multiplying until some one poet is roused to unite them, put them in order, and make of them one grand composition. But to deserve the name of epos there must be not only a popular, a national basis; the epos must come from the heart of the people. A lofty conception, says M. Bréal. It may apply for all he knows to the *Chanson de Roland* and to the *Nibelungen*. Does it apply to the *Iliad*?

The one thing that is lacking in the *Iliad* is popular passion. Between Greeks and Trojans there is perfect impartiality. The most sympathetic personage in the poems is Hektor; the inimitable model of a wife, is Andromache. The Trojans are *μεγάθυμοι*, *μεγαλήτορες*. The allies of the Trojans are *ἀντίθροι*. Think how the Spanish *Romancero* treats the Saracens, how the Servian singers speak of the Turks. The only passage in which the poet departs from his impartiality is the *ἔσσεται ἡμῶν*, which he puts in the mouth of the Trojan hero. In the absence of national passion, in the absence of some Alphonso II of Ferrara to order a poem, of some scholar to collect these legends and fuse them—the period is too remote for that—M. Bréal assumes a college, a corporation charged with the programmes of games and festivals in the land of Lydia, just as in the Middle Ages religious orders devoted themselves to the glorification of a saint or the accomplishment of a great work. In this way we can explain the successive production and the preservation of the work, the unity of the language and of the metre, and at the same time catch a glimpse of the cause of certain inequalities, the introduction of cantos that do not harmonize with the rest, however great their independent merit, the *Διταί*, the *Δολώνεια*, the episode of Sarpedon, and others in which inspiration flags, the bizarre *Μάχη παραποτάμιος*, and what M. Bréal calls the heroi-comic canto of the *Θεομαχία*. In this way, too, we can account for the doublets, the working in of two accounts of the same events. The inexplicable *πείρα* of the second book is a misplacement of the quite explicable *πείρα* of the fourteenth. Admitting, as M. Bréal does, the value of the services of the school which used to engage in comparison of people with people, he thinks that by the dexterous employment of abstract terms these scholars have discolored the facts and volatilized history, have dulled the keenness of vision for differences, and have veiled with their generalizations the antiquity of different epochs. *Iliad* and *Nibelungen* do not belong to the same class. The conclusions obtained from the *Chanson de Roland* do not serve for the *Kalevala*, which the researches of Comparetti have put in the true light. 'Poema creato dal popolo' says Comparetti, 'non

esiste nè può aspettarsi' in direct polarity to F. A. Wolf's 'carmina prope sponte nascuntur'. Ossian may have been responsible for Wolf as the Nibelungen may have been responsible for Lachmann. Grote's Ilias proper and Achilleis find no favor in M. Bréal's eyes nor any of the dissections of the *Kleinliederjäger*. The theory of an Ur-Ilias has no charm for him. It is necessary to discard so much—the *Τειχοσκοπία*, the *Πρεσβεία*, the *Ἔκτορος καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης ὁμιλία*, the *Διομήδους ἀριστεία*, the *Μενελάου ἀριστεία*, all that follows the death of Hektor, even the interview between Achilles and Priam—one of the most beautiful scenes in all literature, says Gottfried Hermann. The Iliad under this treatment 'resembles a French tragedy under the Empire', and it would be the first time in the history of literature that all the beauties of a work had come from the interpolators. This growth from within is not compatible with the hypothesis of a popular origin. It is true that poets have seized upon a legend and enlarged its proportions so as to make of it a drama or an epopee. But it has always been the genius of an individual that has wrought this prodigy. The inevitable conclusion would be a return to the one Homer. But M. Bréal is satisfied with his guild and his *δοιδός*, whose name has been associated with the great poems; and he winds up this half of the book with some specimens of the minute analysis that has characterized recent Homeric research, and with the admission of the probability that writing served as an aid and as a guide to the *δοιδός*, a singer at least in name.

The *Lexilogus* half of the volume lies beyond my competence, and for that matter the review as far as it has gone is only a *Brief Mention* that has outgrown its limits, and must not be taken more seriously than the other bits of cork with which I try to float my trimestrial net. In this department of the Journal I cannot always command the help that I crave.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

---

The Higher Study of English. By ALBERT S. COOK, Professor of the English Language and Literature in Yale University. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906. Pp. 145.

Professor Cook's volume is timely. Never, perhaps, since English became a recognized academic study have its teachers manifested greater divergence regarding their function. On its literary side, we are asked, can English be taught at all? Or, a larger question, can any literature be taught? If so, how? Apart from language?—apart from the body in which it is incarnate? Such questions rest, of course, upon a problem still more fundamental, though one that has not in general been sharply defined

or patiently meditated: *why* should we study literature, and, notably, why our own? Without making any pretense at being a systematic treatise on the pedagogics of English, the present book does, directly or indirectly, contain well matured answers to these and similar questions; and coming from one who is not merely a scholar of international authority, and not merely a gifted writer and delicate critic, but a powerful and philosophic teacher as well, the answers may be profitably taken to heart and pondered. For he does not speak as the scribes.

The volume is made up of four 'occasional' papers: (1) The Province of English Philology, a presidential address delivered before the Modern Language Association in 1897, and pleading for a larger interpretation (the German) of a much abused term; (2) The Teaching of English, an historical sketch, reprinted from the Atlantic for May, 1901; (3) The Relation of Words to Literature, from an address given at Vassar in February, 1906; and (4) Aims in the Graduate Study of English, a paper read at Princeton the month before. The several essays now come before a wider public without essential change; no attempt has been made to give them artificial correlation. They 'overlap' somewhat, as their author says. They do not in the ordinary sense repeat. However, underlying all their variety of argument and illustration, or rather animating it, there is a philosophy of teaching that is at one with itself, as well as consistent with experience. It is not, like an abstract pedagogy, separable from a knowledge of the subject to be taught, or from the personality of the teacher, or from that of the pupil, or from the concrete practice of great historic teachers; it is at once eclectic and individual.

And what sort of answers will this philosophy afford to the simple questions we have outlined above?

Literature can be taught because it must be; the impulse to orderly and thorough knowledge is inherent in our better natures. It can be taught because it has been; because those who have produced the best literature, above all, the ancients, believed that it ought to be studied. What can be studied can be taught. What the ancients, and the wisest of their followers, taught and learned, Americans can yet learn and teach, if they are trained approximately after the fashion of Milton, Dante, and the Greeks. The answer here is optimistic, though it does not point to the path of least resistance.

Again, *how* is literature to be taught? Apart from the language wherein it is enfolded? Apart from the national soul that has made and is making the language? The answer is obvious. Yet the obvious answer implies that in order to understand Milton or Shakespeare as either deserves to be understood, we must have among other things a substantial acquaintance with history and historical grammar. But once more: in order to teach literature, must we really teach *litteras*? Does not the letter kill? No, the letter is also alive, has its share of the spirit that informs the whole organism; *spiritus intus alit*. 'Soule is forme, and

doth the bodie make'—even to the minutest cell. The teacher and the student of the humanities must count nothing that is human as beneath notice. Every jot and tittle of the law is instinct with life. Those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary; and those parts of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor.

On the other hand, shall we study language apart from literature, that is, apart from passion, thought, and sentiment? In the final analysis we cannot. Woe to us if we blindly persist in an effort so unnatural! Nevertheless, for most persons at some time, and by a few specialists much of the time, stress must be laid upon the linguistic side of philology (the only proper term to embrace both linguistics and *belles-lettres*). Such stress is necessary either for the individual or for the general progress in discovering, communicating, and perpetuating what is best in the life of the past and the present.

In the last sentence lies the solution of that more deeply seated yet simple question mooted at the beginning. We study literature through language, we study the past in all its manifestations, in order to discover, to communicate, and to perpetuate what is best in humanity. We study English in order to do this for people of our own blood; the love of letters is patriotic and begins at home. We study English in order that we may have racial life and have it more abundantly.

But what is life? No one can define it. Yet all of us know it. We can at least classify it. First, then, and most important, there is what Wordsworth calls moral life. As the ancients demanded of a poet that he be first of all a good man, so as not to miss the beauty which is inherent in the moral order, similarly the teacher of English must be, however indirectly, a moral teacher. However indirectly, it is the nature of teaching to be didactic. To say that we must teach either truth or beauty by indirection is merely to say that no end can be attained without means. The point is, to keep the end in view.

To summarize as we have done, in our own words, is doubtless to confine Professor Cook's thought within unduly narrow limits, and to rob it of its concreteness—certainly to suppress the specific adaptations it undergoes in the several essays with reference to different aspects and needs of American education. However, instead of marring any of his illustrations by taking them out of their context (where every teacher of English ought to read them), we prefer to cite one or two illustrations which Professor Cook himself might have used, drawing them from sources similar to those on which the best part of his theory and practice is based, that is, from the best poets and critics.

When, for example, it is urged, as in some quarters it has been lately, that literature cannot be taught, or at least that the teacher of English cannot in general propose to himself as his chief and final aim to impart a sense of literary values, we may urge in return the conviction of Wordsworth that literature ought to be

studied, and the belief of Coleridge that it can be taught, and taught according to a conscious method suitable to schools.

Thus Wordsworth, dividing all readers into five main classes, credits only the fifth, composed of students, with any sureness of appreciation: "And, lastly, there are many, who, having been enamoured of this art in their youth, have found leisure, after youth was spent, to cultivate general literature; in which poetry has continued to be comprehended *as a study*." That his conception of study included inquiry into things small as well as great, and into technical matters which some of our wiseacres nowadays would exclude from the class-room incontinently, is evident; for, having in mind the equipment of the poet and the properly trained reader of poetry, he says of the rest: "There can be no presumption in saying of most readers, that it is not probable they will be so well acquainted with the various stages through which words have passed." This seems exactly in the tenor of the essay on *The Relation of Words to Literature*.

And the following, from Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, is even more striking in its harmony with the method advocated by Professor Cook throughout; it contains implicitly more than one weighty principle which space has forbidden us to mention.

"At school (Christ's Hospital)", says Coleridge, "I enjoyed the inestimable advantage of a very sensible, though at the same time, a very severe master, the Reverend James Bowyer. He early moulded my taste to the preference of Demosthenes to Cicero, of Homer and Theocritus to Virgil, and again of Virgil to Ovid. He habituated me to compare Lucretius (in such extracts as I then read), Terence, and above all the chaster poems of Catullus, not only with the Roman poets of the, so-called, silver and brazen ages; but with even those of the Augustan era: and on grounds of plain sense and universal logic to see and assert the superiority of the former in the truth and nativeness both of their thoughts and diction. At the same time that we were studying the Greek tragic poets, he made us read Shakspeare and Milton as lessons: and they were the lessons too, which required most time and trouble to *bring up*, so as to escape his censure. I learned from him, that poetry, even that of the loftiest and, seemingly, that of the wildest odes, had a logic of its own, as severe as that of science; and more difficult, because more subtle, more complex, and dependent on more, and more fugitive causes. In the truly great poets, he would say, there is a reason assignable, not only for every word, but for the position of every word. . . . He sent us to the University excellent Latin and Greek scholars, and tolerable Hebraists. Yet our classical knowledge was the least of the good gifts, which we derived from his zealous and conscientious tutorage."

Unfortunately, these have not been the "usual courses of learning," or anything like them, perhaps since the days of Saint Augustine. Were they general now, the author of *The Higher Study of English* might, finally, be supported by the authority of Augustine's mother: "because she accounted that those usual courses of learning would not only be no hindrance, but even some help towards attaining Thee in time to come."

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

LANE COOPER.

## REPORTS.

### ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK, VOL. IX. First Half.

Pp. 1-2. E. Wölfflin, Vorwort. An announcement of the continuation of the Archiv, but not quarterly as heretofore.

3-16. E. Wölfflin, Die alten und die neuen Aufgaben des Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Discussion of forms, such as *besta*, *meletrix*, etc.; of inflectional peculiarities, such as the infin. in *-uiri*; of points in prosody, *temerē*, *rēfert* and *rēfert*; of etymology, semasiology and syntax, most of which have been elucidated in Vols. I-VIII of the ALL.

16. E. Wölfflin, *Tresviri*, *Treviri*. Originally both parts of *tresviri* were declined, then *triumviri* and similar forms arose by analogy and through the influence of abbreviations in inscriptions. That the vulgar form was *treviri* is shown by Cicero's pun in *Fam.* 7. 13. 2 on the geographical name *Treviri*. The first syllable of the latter is long (see *Lucan* I, 441).

17-45. H. Blase, Der Konjunktiv des Präsens im Bedingungssatze. After a criticism of the classifications of Ellendt, Kühner, and others, the forms *si sit . . . sit* and *si sit . . . est (erit)* are examined in detail. A table showing the usage of representative writers from Plautus to Avitus is given. The general conclusion is that the form *si sit . . . sit* gradually disappeared, in the popular speech perhaps in the classical period, while *si sit . . . est* and *si sit . . . erit* were in general use down to and during the sixth century.

45-46. E. Wölfflin, Genetiv, Accusativ und Nominativ absolutus. The gen. abs. in Latin is a Grecism, which is common in the ecclesiastical translation literature. It occurs first in the letters of Clement and in Irenaeus. It is most frequent with the pres. part. and in the singular. The example in *Ulp. Dig.* 36. 1. 4 is an interpolation. The perf. pass. part. is occasionally found, an isolated example in *Bell. Hisp.* 14. 1. The acc. abs. arose through the addition of a parasitic *-m* to the abl. of *a*-stems and was extended to other stems. It appears in the literature in the second half of the fourth century. The nominative absolute, as in Romance, was a transition from the accusative. It is found in the *Act. Martyrum* and in *Silvia*, *Peregr.* fol. 71 cod.

47-51. G. Landgraf, Die Anfänge des selbständigen Gebrauches des Particip. futuri activi. This is rare before Livy and falls

into three classes: 1) the part. has the force of an adj.; 2) it is a pure participle; 3) it expresses purpose and is equivalent to a supine or to a relative clause with *ut* or *qui*. To 1) belongs strictly only *futurus*, which occurs only once in Caesar, but is frequent in Cicero and especially in Sallust. Cicero also uses synonyms of *futurus*, but consciously avoids *moriturus*, which is found in poetry (Ennius and Verg.). 2) appears first in Cic., *ad Att.* 8. 9. 2 and is frequent in Sall. 3) is also first general in Sall. The earliest instance is in C. Gracch. *ap. Gell.* 11. 10. 4 with a verb of motion. The origin of the construction is from the first periphrastic conjugation, as is suggested by an example in Cic. *Verr.* 1. 56, *adest . . . laturus*, which is almost equivalent to *est . . . laturus*. Between Sall. and Liv. it is found only in the *Bell. Afr.*, the author of which uses it like Liv. with verbs not implying motion. In the *abl. abs.* first in Pollio, then in Liv. and silver Latin. The extension of the independent use of the part. is due to Sall. through Greek influence, though the origin, as suggested, may be independent of Greek influence.

52. C. Weyman, *Itoria* (see *ALL.* VIII. 139 f., *A. J. P.* XXVII. 464). Another example from Optatius I. 1, p. 3. 7 f., *cod. Petropolitani. Venum Tempus*. Occurs with the force of *ver* in an enumeration of the seasons in *Aug. de Gen. ad lit. imperf.* 13, p. 487. 20 f. *Zycha. Zum Corpus Glossariorum*. In IV. 491. 43, *cautus: prudens vel accutus*, for *cautus* read *catus*, and cf. *Aug. de Genesi ad lit.* 12. 18, p. 467. 4 f. Whether the gloss is derived from Augustine, or Augustine took the definition from the gloss, is uncertain.

53-80. A. Sonny, *Zu den Sprichwörtern und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Additions to the collections of Otto and others.

80. E. Wölfflin, *Satrapicus*. Discussion, on the whole unfavorable, of the proposition of Heidenhain to read this for *parasitica* in the letter of Augustus to Maecenas offering Horace the post of private secretary.

81-100. E. Wölfflin, *Die lateinische Uebersetzung des Briefes des Clemens an die Korinther* (dedicated to P. Odilo Rottmanner, O. S. B., Dr. Theol.). Since in the case of such works the form is important as well as the subject matter, the translation is for the most part scrupulously exact. In some cases Greek words are avoided, but not always. In many cases an effort is made to translate the Greek words by Latin words of the same stem: e. g. *γινώσκω* by *cognosco*. In doing this errors are sometimes made. Numerous Greek constructions are found: the *gen. of exclamation* and of comparison; *gen. abs.*; final clause with *qualiter* = *ὅπως*, etc. The difficulty of translating compound words is met in some cases by periphrases, in others by translating only a part of the word. Occasionally new Latin compounds are coined, such as *longanimitas*. The use of hendiadys and the devices for trans-

lating compounds with  $\alpha$ -privative, the verbal in  $-\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , and the aor. act. part. are also discussed. It is clear from occasional misunderstanding of the Greek that the mother tongue of the translator was Latin, as well as from his free use of alliteration. The vulgar character of the Latin is also made clear. The date of the translation is assigned to a later time than was assumed by Morin, namely to that of Tertullian. The place where it was written cannot be determined, nor whether the citations from the Bible were translated from the Greek or taken from a Latin version.

101-105. E. Wölfflin, *Der Genetiv des Wertes und der Ablativ des Preises*. The genitive is originally an instrumental abl., the means by which a thing is purchased. It is then extended by analogy to verbs of selling and valuing. Special varieties are *carus* and *dignus* with an abl., and *care* (*-ius*, *-issime*) and *vilissime emere*. The abl. is found in early Latin but is rare in the classical period. The genitive of value was originally one of quality, at first used attributively and later in the predicate. The abl. and the gen. constructions were soon confused and the original distinction lost sight of.

109-115. E. Wölfflin, *Der Telo incessens des Polyklet*. An examination from the lexical standpoint of *nudum talo incessentem* in Plin. NH. 34. 55. As it stands, the phrase can only mean one who throws an *astragalos* at someone. W. favors the conjecture of Benndorf, *nudum telo incessentem*, in the sense of a javelin thrower.

116-125. M. Hölzl—E. Wölfflin, *Actio*. *Lexicon* article (first part).

126-131. E. Wölfflin, *Accessa-accessum*. *Lexicon* articles.

131. M. Bonnett, *Obversatio*. Would read this word, not found elsewhere, in Sen. Epist. 88. 26, instead of *observatio*.

132-141. *Miscellen*. W. Heraeus, *Obsidium = Praesidium, subsidium?* The gloss in Festus, 193<sup>a</sup>. 19, *obsidium tamquam praesidium, subsidium recte dicitur*, does not refer to the meaning but to the form of *obsidium*. The usual form is *obsidio*. *Colligere = tollere*. Several instances of this usage (see ALL. VIII. 140 and 482, A. J. P. XXVII. 464). In pseud-Vict. de Vir. Ill. 1. 3, *mox Faustulus pastor collectos Accae Laurentiae coniugi educandos dedit*, Wigja wrongly marks *collectos* as corrupt.

L. Havet, *LL in corcodillus*. This spelling is not necessarily confined to late Latin, as the lexx. assert. Notes on the phonology of *l* in Latin.

C. Weyman, *Procedere = proferri* (see ALL. VIII. 157). The usage is liturgical. *Addenda lexicis*. From *Apocrypha Anecdota*, ed. M. R. James, Cambridge, 1893.

W. Schmitz, *Supervacuaneus* (see ALL. VIII. 562). Occurs in the Commentary on the Tironian notes in an etymological group

E. Wölfflin, *Die Perfektformen amai und venui*. Testimony to the former in the Dacian wax-tablets (Bruns, *Fontes Iur. Rom. Ant.* ed. 5. p. 261) and in Probus, *Gr. Lat.* IV. 182. 11. Regards the latter as formed with u for differentiation from the present (*venit, venit*) rather than by analogy with *tenui*, etc. The earliest example is in CIL. VIII. 2532 (oration of Hadrian). Zum Betacismus (Sall. Cat. 51. 27). In *omnia mala exempla ex bonis orta sunt* would read *novis* for *bonis* (through *nobis*). Rebus, which is given by the best MSS, is an interpolation.

142-160. Review of the Literature for 1894.

161-167. F. Leo, *Zum plautischen Lexikon*. *Arvina*, Poen. 1016; *calones*, Poen. 1168; *conspicitur* for *conspuitur*, Curc. 503; *Hedytium* for *Hedylium*, Pseud. 188; *inertia* for *inhaeret etiam*, Merc. 29 (not Plautine); *populo* for *pipulo*, Mil. 584; *probe* for *prope*, Bacch. 1160; *prostibilest* (= *prostibilis est*) for *prostibiles*, Stich. 765; *bellum* for *vallum*, Cas. 851.

167-168. L. Havet, *Emere af*. Would read *af quaestoribus* for *de* and *a quaestoribus* in Plaut. Capt. 34, 111 and 453.

169-176. G. Landgraf, *Naevius, Apuleius, Ciceroscholien in Glossaren*. Since a number of the glosses in vol. V of the *Corpus Glossariorum* correspond more or less exactly with the excerpts of Festus from Paulus, a comparison with the latter throws light on the text-criticism of both. In some cases too the glosses correspond with the text of Festus or with an intermediary stage between Festus and Paulus. Such a comparison also throws light on the correct reading of the citations from ancient writers. Several of these from Naevius and Ennius and Apuleius, from whose *de Deo Socratis* 20 glosses are taken, are discussed. Light is also thrown on the Scholiasta Gronovianus on Cicero.

177-192. E. Wölfflin, *Sescenti, mille, centum, trecenti als unbestimmte und runde Zahlen*. The use of *sescenti* is connected with the old-Italic importance of the number six, of which examples are cited. The instances of its use are comparatively few outside of the *sermo vulgaris* of comedy and of letters. As early as the time of Cicero it began to give way to *mille* through Greek influence. The use of *mille* was especially common in the Augustan poets. It begins, however, in Terence and continues until late times. The adverb *miliens* is also found. *Quingenti*, the half of *mille*, is occasionally used. So also *milia*. *Centum* is extensively used as a round number, especially in poetry and in ecclesiastical Latin. *Ducenti*, the double of *centum*, is found to some extent in poetry. More frequent, as would be expected from the well-known use of the number three, is *trecenti*. These

numbers show the influence of the duodecimal as well as of the decimal system. A lexicon article on *sescenti* follows, of the scope and kind proposed for the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

192. J. L. de Vasconcellos, *Aedeolum*. This word, found in an inscription now at Lisbon, is a by-form of *aediculum*. \**Aedilum* and \**aedeculum* may have been intermediate forms.

193-230. O. Hey, *Die Semasiologie*. A thoughtful and stimulating article, in which the literature of the subject is examined and an attempt made to define its "Prinzipien". It cannot well be reduced to an abstract.

231-245. F. Ruess, *Ergänzung des lateinischen Wörterbuches durch die tironischen Noten*. An examination of the edition of W. Schmitz, with a number of independent observations, is followed by a list of words not found in the Latin lexicons, arranged according to their form. Words are included which are cited by Georges in his *Handlexikon* or in his *Wortformen* as occurring only in the Tironian Notes, designated by G or G W.

245. M. Ihm, *Iurgia, iuria*. Testimony to the vulgar pronunciation of *iurgium* as *iurjum* in an African inscription.

246. E. Hauler, *Ala (scuti)*. In Livy, IX. 41. 18 and in XXX. 34. 2 would take *ala* in the sense of the rim of the shield.

247-284. Ph. Thielmann, *Die europäischen Bestandteile des lateinischen Sirach*. In the Latin translation of the book of Sirach (see ALL. VIII. 501 fol., A. J. P. XXVII. 471) chapters 44-50 are not by the same hand as chapters 1-43 and 51. The former bear the separate title of *Laus Patrum*. The Prologue is by still a different translator. The *Laus Patrum* shows none of the signs of African Latin which were observed in chapters 1-43, and is of European origin. The same thing is true of the Prologue. These theses are supported by a careful examination of the Latinity of these parts of the work, including a comparison with the Greek original and an examination of the citations from the Bible.

285-291. E. Wölfflin, *Die Ellipse von Navis*. After a discussion of the general subject, the use of adjectives as substantives with the ellipsis of *navis* is examined. The conclusion is reached that this form of ellipsis originated in the language of everyday life and only gradually made its way into literature.

292-297. E. Wölfflin, *Actio*. Conclusion of the lexicon article on pp. 116 fol.

297. E. Wölfflin, *Carduus, cardus, cardo*. Though *carduus* did not pass into the Romance languages, it is found in late Latin as a learned word. Examples of *cardus* and *cardo*, which are marked as non-existent in Körting (1891) are given.

298-308. Miscellen. P. Geyer, Zu Silviae peregrinatio ad loca sancta. Further testimony to the Gallic origin of this work, mainly from linguistic evidence. *Orum der Rand*. An example of this word in the Itinerarium of Antoninus of Placentia (570 A. D.) p. 15. 6 Gildermeister.

J. Hausleiter, ἔσθίω. τρώγω. As edere gave place to manducare, so ἔσθίω gave place to τρώγω in Biblical Greek.

J. v. d. Vliet, Notulae ad Glossas nominum.

A. Funck, Praemiscuus = promiscuus und Aehnliches. Examples from later Latin of the confusion of prae- and pro- in compound words.

R. Ehwald, Ablativisches d bei Livius. In XXII. 10. 4 fol., quod fieri oportebit, would take quod as an ablative. Nequiquam mit Negation. Another example of this usage (cf. ALL. II. 11 and II. 615) in Verg. Aen. VI. 118. Gallaria. This word in the poem against Nicomachus Flavianus, 46, is not to be amended, but is equivalent to gallica, the sandal of the priests of Cybele, a word possibly coined in jest. Auriga. Would derive from auri-rēga, with loss of a syllable by dissimilation and compensatory lengthening.

C. Goetz, Constitutus = καθεστώς, ὥν bei Cyprian. A number of examples of this usage from Cyprian's genuine works (cf. ALL. VII. 481).

W. Schmitz, Effulcit. Effulsit. An example in C. N. T. tab. 72, 1<sup>b</sup> from the Leyden Vossianus O. 94, fol. 36<sup>v</sup>.

L. Havet, LL dans culleus. Culleus is to be added to the examples of ll for λ (ALL. IX. 135). Coleus perhaps belongs to an earlier period.

309-330. Review of the Literature for 1894.

330-332. Necrology. Henry Nettleship by Robinson Ellis, with a note by the Editor. Heinrich Keil by the Editor.

333-353. E. Wölfflin, Zur Zahlensymbolik (mit Probeartikel Septem und Novem). Beside the system of reckoning by decades we have combinations based upon three (3, 9, 27, 81). Seven took the place of nine in later times; thus the nine artes liberales of Varro became seven in Martianus Capella. This use of seven, which was of Greek origin, came into Roman literature at least as early as Sulla, and was taken up by the Church. Lexicon articles on septem and novem are appended, of the scope proposed for the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXXIII (1904).

Janvier.

P. Meyer. Notice du ms. Med.-Pal. 141 de la Laurentienne (Vies de Saints). 49 pages. This manuscript is a large folio volume of 330 leaves containing various lives of saints in Old French prose. At the end it bears the date 1399, having been copied by Jehans li Escohiers at Arras. Most of the legends were derived from the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, but others come from sources that have not as yet been identified.

P. E. Guarnerio. Postille sul Lessico sardo: Terza Serie. 21 pages. The etymology of some 19 words or groups of words is discussed at some length. They represent for the most part the Pre-Classical stage of Latin, and show many interesting developments.

O. Densusianu. Notes de Lexicologie roumaine. 16 pages. The etymology of some 25 words is here investigated by the author of the well-known *Histoire de la Langue roumaine*.

Mélanges. Gédéon Huet, *La Parabole des faux amis*. A. Thomas, *Encore l'anc franç.* Gers. Auguste Longnon, *Estourmi de Bourges*. Louis Brandin, *Un Fragment de la Vie de Saint Gilles en vers français* (this fragment is intercalated in a Latin prose life of the saint).

Comptes rendus. P. Meyer, *Die Aussprache des c und t im klassischen Latein* (Ov. Densusianu). François Béthune, *Les écoles historiques de Saint-Denis et Saint-Germain-des-Prés* (P. Meyer). A. C. White, *A Translation of the Quæstio de Aqua et Terra with a Discussion of its Authenticity* (Paget Toynbee). Henri Hauvette, *De Laurentio de Primofato qui primus Joannis Boccaccii opera quædam gallice transtulit ineunte seculo XV* (A. Thomas). Joseph Nève, *Antoine de La Salle, sa vie et ses ouvrages d'après des documents inédits* (Gaston Raynaud). E. Langlois, *Recueil d'Arts de seconde rhétorique* (Émile Picot). Henri Hauvette, *Un exilé Florentin à la cour de France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: Luigi Alamanni* (Émile Picot). P. Papahagi, *Megleno-Romîni* (Ov. Densusianu). G. Weigand, *Praktische Grammatik der rumänischen Sprache* (Ov. Densusianu). *Miscellanea di Studi critici edita in onore di Arturo Graf* (Cesare de Lollis). *Società filologica romana* (P. Meyer).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXVII. 3, 4, 5, 6 (Mario Roques). *Neunter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig*, VIII (Mario Roques). *Studi Romanzi*, I (P. Meyer).

Chronique. Obituary notice of Alexandre Héron. Purchase of the Romance portion of the library of Gaston Paris for the *École des Hautes-Études*. Founding of the *Société amicale G. Paris*. Announcements of books soon to be published. Notes by Em. Walberg.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 9 titles. The *Espurgatoire saint Patriz* of Marie de France, with a text of the Latin original, by T. Atkinson Jenkins. *Bruchstücke altfranzösischer Dichtung aus den in der Kubbet, in Damaskus, gefundenen Handschriften*, von A. Tobler.

#### Avril.

F. Lot. *Notes Historiques sur Aye d'Avignon*. 18 pages. The author of this article endeavors to identify with historical personages two of the heroes mentioned in the above poem. Aleran de Troiesin was a French baron of the ninth century, while Aubouin was a French count of the same epoch who fell under the royal displeasure, and hence was considered a traitor.

P. Meyer. *L'Enfant voué au Diable: Rédaction en vers*. 16 pages. This is a Miracle of the Virgin found in an Arsenal manuscript, but also frequently met with elsewhere. "La rédaction du ms. de l'Arsenal présente des traits particuliers qui m'ont décidé à la publier, d'autant plus que l'écriture étant difficile à lire, ce petit poème n'est pas à la portée des jeunes étudiants étrangers qui viennent chercher dans nos bibliothèques les éléments de faciles publications."

A. Piaget. *La Belle Dame sans Merci et ses Imitations: V. Les Erreurs du jugement de la Belle Dame sans Merci; VI. La Belle Dame qui eut Merci; VII. Dialogue d'un Amoureux et de sa Dame*. 30 pages. The first of these poems is preserved in two manuscripts, the second in fifteen manuscripts, the third in four manuscripts. The first poem is published in a critical edition, while the others are merely described and commented upon.

A. Thomas. *Étymologies lyonnaises*. 21 pages. The etymology of fifty words is discussed more or less at length by the author of this article, whose studies in this field are so favorably known to the scholarly world.

Silvio Pieri. *Il Tipo avverbiale di Carpone -i*. 9 pages. This article first enumerates the adverbs belonging to this class, then discusses the theory of Prof. Meyer-Lübke, proposes a new explanation, and examines typical examples.

Mélanges. P. Meyer, *Les Trois Maries: Mystère liturgique de Reims*. John Taggart Clark, ND and MB *protoniques en Italien*. R.-J. Cuervo, *Mana y Maná*. R.-J. Cuervo, ¿*Maguer ó Magüer?* P. E. Guarnerio, *Ancora di ti-(zi-) Elemento ascitizio in parecchi Appellativi d'animali nei Dialetti sardi*. Ant. Thomas, *Prov. amenla*. Ant. Thomas, *Prov. conobre*. Ant. Thomas, *Franç. cerneau*. Ant. Thomas, *Franç. noyau*.

Comptes rendus. R. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual elemental de Gramática histórica española* (Alfred Morel-Fatio). Gustav Körting, *Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch, Zweite Ausgabe*

(Ov. Densusianu). Clemente Merlo, I nomi romanzi delle stagioni e dei mesi (Ant. Thomas).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXVIII. 1 (M. Roques, with discussion of etymologies). Revue des langues romanes, XLIV-XLV (P. Meyer). Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, XXIV-XXV (A. Jeanroy). Bulletin de la société des anciens textes français, 1903.

Chronique. Burning of the National Library of Turin. Various literary notices.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 26 titles. De la littérature didactique du moyen âge s'adressant spécialement aux femmes par Alice A. Hentsch. The Mediæval Stage, by E. K. Chambers. The Song of Roland translated into English Prose, by Isabel Butler. Les origines de la Poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge, par Alfred Jeanroy (Deuxième édition).

Juillet.

G. Paris. Le Mode et les Étapes de l' Altération du C en Gallo-Roman. 12 pages. This article was written in 1892, but had never been published. It was found among the author's papers after his death, and has been published by the editors with a note stating the circumstances of the case.

Jessie L. Weston. Wauchier de Denain as a Continuator of Perceval and the Prologue of the Mons MS. 11 pages. This article contains interesting studies on the Grail legend based on various manuscripts, especially the one mentioned in the title. Several early editions bearing on the subject in hand have also been drawn upon.

A. Delboulle. Mots Obscurs et Rares de l'ancienne langue française (suite). 24 pages. This article is in continuation of several similar articles previously published, and is lexicographical in its nature. It is based upon an extensive reading in Mediæval manuscripts and documents which have not come under the eyes of the dictionary-makers.

Giacomo de Gregorio. Notizia di un Trattato di Mascalcia in dialetto siciliano del secolo XIV. 19 pages with a facsimile of mediæval bits from a manuscript in a private library. The author of the article shows that Giordano Ruffo was the source of Lorenzo Rusio in his treatise on the subject.

A. Thomas. Alain Chartier Chanoine de Paris, d'après des documents inédits. 16 pages. There are here published several legal documents bearing on the relations of Alain Chartier to Notre-Dame de Paris, and upon the death of the celebrated Old French author.

Mélanges. G. Huet, *La Parabole des Faux Amis: une nouvelle version*. E. Langlois, *Anc. franç. vizele*. A. Delboulle, *Anc. fr. coupee*. Georges Millardet, *Béarnais talaraque "toile d'araignée"*. A. Thomas, *Anc. franç. entreacor*. Ad. Mussafia, *Per il Tristano di Thomas*, ed. Bédier.

Comptes rendus. Maurice Wilmotte, *L'évolution du roman français aux environs de 1150* (A. Jeanroy). P. Zarifopol, *Kritischer Text der Lieder Richards de Fournival*; R. Schmidt, *Die Lieder des Andrieu Contredit d'Arras* (A. Jeanroy). H. Jarník, *Studie über die Komposition der Fierabrasdichtungen* (M. Roques). Dr. Bernhard Dimand, *Zur rumänischen Moduslehre* (M. Roques). *Atti del Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche*, Vol. IV. *Atti della sezione III: Storia delle letterature* (P. Meyer). Edward Moore, *Studies in Dante, Third Series; Miscellaneous Essays* (Paget Toynbee). *Une énigme d'histoire littéraire: L'auteur des XV Joyes de Mariage* (Joseph Bédier). Mildred K. Pope, *Étude sur la langue de frère Angier* (A. Thomas).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXVIII, 2 (M. Roques). *Zehnter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache* (M. Roques). *Studi medievali*, I, 1 (P. Meyer). *Annales du Midi*, III-XV (A. Jeanroy et A. Thomas). *Bulletin archéologique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, 1901-1903 (P. Meyer).

Chronique. Obituary notice of Édouard Koschwitz. Various literary notices, especially referring to the Old French manuscripts of the late Rev. Walter Sneyd.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 6 titles. *Die Entwicklung des lateinischen aqua in den romanischen Sprachen, im besondern in den französischen, francoprovenzalischen, italienischen und rätischen Dialekten*, von Clara Hürlimann. *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Vol. I, 2d. edition. *Die Laute und Formen der Apokalypse en français*, von W. Schmiel.

Octobre.

A. G. Van Hamel. *Cligès et Tristan*. 25 pages. It has long been a mooted question among scholars as to whether Chrétien de Troyes was influenced by antecedent tradition in writing his *Cligès*, or whether his novel points of view were his own solution of the problem of illegitimate love which lies at the bottom of the *Tristan romances*. The author of the article thinks that *Cligès* is "une œuvre de controverse et d'émulation littéraire."

Léopold Constans. *Le Songe vert*. 50 pp. This curious Old French poem is preserved in only two manuscripts, one of which is extremely difficult to decipher. Though it is in places wearisome and weak in style, it nevertheless possesses a real interest for the

study of courtly love in the fourteenth century, while certain passages denote an ingenious and observing turn of mind on the part of the author. The opening lines of the poem appear to refer to the Black Death of 1347 and 1348, and thus serve to date it.

A. Thomas. *Notes et Documents inédits pour servir à la biographie de Pierre de Nesson.* 16 pages. Pierre de Nesson was an Old French poet attached to the retinue of the Duc de Berry and to that of the Duc de Bourbon at various periods in his life, which was cast in the stormy times of the Hundred Years' War. He came of a draper's family of Aigueperse in the province of Basse Auvergne, and nearly lost his life in the insurrection of the populace in 1413.

A. Delboulle. *Mots Obscurs et Rares de l'ancienne langue française (suite).* 45 pages. This instalment is accompanied by numerous footnotes due to a number of scholars who seek to throw additional light on obscure meanings and derivations.

Mélanges. A. Jeanroy, *Anc. franç. frengier.* A. Jeanroy, *Anc. franç. aengier, ongier, franç. mod. enger.* A. Thomas, *Anc. franç. chalemine, ital. giallamina.* A. Thomas, *La Date de la mort de Thomas de Saint-Pierre.*

Comptes-rendus. Dr. Giulio Bertoni, *I trovatori minori di Genova* (A. Jeanroy). Dr. Wilhelm Bohns, *Abrils issi' e mays intrava: Lehrgedicht von Raimon Vidal von Bezaudun* (A. Jeanroy). A. Restori, *La Gaite de la tor* (A. Jeanroy). Max Richter, *Die Lieder des altfranzösischen Lyrikers Jehan de Nueville* (A. Jeanroy). Edgar Ewing Brandon, *Robert Estienne et le Dictionnaire français au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (A. Thomas).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXVIII. 3. 4 (M. Roques, with discussion of etymologies). *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*, Nos. 37-49 (A. Thomas). *Annales du Midi*, XIV (A. Thomas).

Chronique. Obituary notice of George Mohl. Literary notes.

*Livres annoncés sommairement.* 10 titles. *Poema de Fernan Gonçalez, texto critico con introducción, notas y glosario*, por C. Carroll Marden (Note by A. Morel-Fatio). *Two Old Spanish Versions of the Disticha Catonis*, by Karl Pietsch (Note by A. Morel-Fatio). *La Vida de Santo Domingo de Silos par Gonzalo de Berceo, édition critique publiée par John D. Fitz-Gerald* (Note by A. Morel-Fatio). *Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre celtique*, par A. Le Braz. *Études sur l'Espagne, Troisième série*, par A. Morel-Fatio.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

### BRIEF MENTION.

The 'Wissenschaftliche Beilage' of the 'Index Lectionum' and the 'Gymnasialprogramm' is an old German institution, as it is a perpetual plague to those who have the mania, the divine mania for completeness (A. J. P. XXIV 482). I turn over the pages of those that I had bound up during my novitiate in 1850-1853, and the keen boyish interest comes back and with it the once familiar figures of the various *professores eloquentiae*, whose special business it was to prepare the official salutations and the official salaams. It was in the Bonn Indices of my time that Ritschl first published specimens of his memorable work in Latin Inscriptions, his *Columna rostrata* and his *Miliarium Popillianum* and it was from one of these Indices that I learned to write Attius. Needless to say, I have gone back to Accius. But it was in Berlin that the office of the indicist, so to speak, was taken most seriously. The 'Altmeister' Boeckh, who led the procession, was in dead earnest about his academic performances. The familiar lines of Schiller, 'Den schlechten Mann muss man verachten der nie bedacht was er vollbringt', always come back to my mind when I think of him, for he taught us to despise thoughtlessness and served by precept and example as a quickener of the philological conscience. Time has reversed many of his decisions, χρόνος γὰρ εὐμαρὴς θεός, and, as I have pointed out elsewhere (cf. also A. J. P. VII 274), the illustrations of his 'Encyclopaedie u. Methodologie' are often tragically ironical, but the lesson of his life abides and the memory of the large pattern he set the beginners of fifty years ago. To him the Latin form was no trifle, and Grecian as he was, he paid the Latin language a memorable tribute, which it may be well to recall in these American days of easy divorce (A. J. P. XXV 480): 'Mascula potissimum Romanorum oratio, quae virium robore etiam Graecam superat, etiamnunc mihi videtur optima stili dilucidi, elegantis, exacti, gravis magistra esse et q. s. (Kl. Schr. I 328). Of course, Latin is 'Zopf', in fact, was fast becoming 'Zopf' in Boeckh's day (Encycl. u. Method. S. 306), but for all that, the abandonment of Latin as a means of intercommunication seems to be a sad mistake; and in certain moods, I regret that Latin is not compulsory. Latin, any kind of Latin, would check the hypertrophy of psychological syntax and make the antics of *Brief Mention* next to impossible.

---

Boeckh was not averse to spacious themes for the Index Lectionum, but after all a man is at his best in his own sphere;

and it is a happy sign in this country that our academic authorities when they invite a man of distinction to discourse on festal occasions are showing more and more preference that the guest of honour should speak on a subject of which he has proved his mastery rather than on topics of national or world-wide significance, and so the Berlin indices have had to do these many years with the domain of classical studies. In this office Boeckh was succeeded by Lachmann, who held it only for a short time. Lachmann was followed by Moriz Haupt, upon whose death in 1874 VAHLEN began the memorable service which came to an end in 1906. The demand on the prooemiast is much more severe than the uninitiated might suppose. To be ready every six months with a paper that shall be a true *ζῆλον*, that shall present a philological theme of real importance, at all events, of real significance, a definite addition to the sum of that which is known, an exemplification of scientific method, and a model of academic form as well, that is no easy task, and to have carried on the work with unfaltering courage and unfailing spirit as well as unvarying success for all these years must be counted among the memorable achievements of a rare man. Such work necessarily diminishes the output in other directions, and, although VAHLEN has enough to his credit in book-form to insure him a commanding position among the classical leaders of the last half-century, there has been a certain loss to the scholarly world. But if he only knew—he can only divine—how these leaves for the healing of philological diseases have been sought and treasured and consulted in other than German circles, he would have no regrets, if indeed he has regrets. But why should he not have committed the results that are incorporated in the *Index Lectionum* to some of the many philological journals of Germany, where they would have been readily accessible? In the *Index Lectionum* the learning seems to be as water spilt on the ground. Even so. But the water spilt on the ground, while it may not be gathered up again, fertilizes after all, and this is the point that VAHLEN emphasizes in the preface to his *Opuscula Academica* (Teubner). These *prooemia* are not mere contributions to knowledge, they are lessons in the art of advancing knowledge. They constitute a school for those who are entering on the philological career. They are so many *contiones ad clerum*, so to speak, delivered by one who has a right to an utterance. Such lessons might be regarded as impertinences in a philological journal, all the contributors to which are supposed to be trained observers, and not to need the lessons that VAHLEN has to impress. And yet when I take up, for instance, some new edition of an Aristophanic play, cobbled together to meet a supposed demand or to show off a few fanciful interpretations, a few hit or miss illustrations, I cannot help wishing that the editor had pondered the warning of VAHLEN: *Itaque iis si qui in Aristophane cognoscendo operam collaturi*

sint, auctores simus, primum ut centies repetita lectione in familiaritatem quandam poetae sese insinuent, deinde interpretatione grammatica vires exercent ita ut verborum vim et usum impensa cura perspiciant, sententiarum motus, orationis formas, sermonum naturam et itinera, poetae in hoc omni genere consuetudinem ac libidinem subtili ac minuta observatione persequantur. An edition that can be rent in sunder by the milkteeth of a Greek seminarian has no right to exist.

---

It is very natural that the illustrious scholar should have felt a desire to gather up these documents of a long and varied activity into some permanent form, but collections of occasional Latin essays are not looked on with favor by the fraternity of the Sosii, and the matter had been dismissed from the author's mind when former hearers came forward and insured the publication of the series. They could have rendered no better service. The first volume embraces the *prooemia* (I-XXXIII) from the summer semester of 1875 to the summer semester of 1891. The second volume will complete the record of this part of a high career, the initial steps of which it was my privilege to witness (A. J. P. XXII 229, XXIV 483).

---

Time was when we were all sun-struck (A. J. P. XXVII 359). Every myth was a sun-myth. The Nibelungen was a sun-myth. The barge of Arthur, the *δέπας χρύσεον* of Stesichoros is still, for aught I know, a sun-myth (A. J. P. XX 213), and so is the Holy Grail, unless the Baconians have made of it a cipher for the *trivium*, GRL standing for Grammar, Rhetoric and Logic. True, there were some unscientific persons who took a human interest in such a hero as Odysseus and, mindful of the proverbial sailor's port ('any port in a storm'), and of the familiar use of *λιμὴν* in Greek poetry, sacred and profane (A. J. P. X 89), measured his voyage by his loves as one measures the voyage of Goethe's life by the incarnations of the Eternal Feminine that marked his career, if they did not make it (A. J. P. XXIII 111). Well might one say from this point of view that Odysseus' life was but a sleep and a forgetting. But Kirke with her black magic, and Kalypso with her white magic, and Penelope, the beginning and the provisional end, were all volatilized by these heliolaters into vague personifications. Odysseus, the setting sun, passed from the couch of Kirke, the daughter of Helios, to the couch of Kalypso, the concealer, to the couch of Penelope, the mantle-weaver, the cloud-weaver. But the rest of the acts of Odysseus which he did and his might and how he fought with the Nebulones, are they not written in the chronicles of Paley and the other kings of the solar theory? However, the human interest would not down, and people began to ask whether after all the sun was everything,

whether the life of that 'naked and shivering' flower, the ἄνθρωπος-ἄνθεύς we call man, might not have something to do with mythology; and for a number of years anthropology has been claiming more and more space; and as I take up M. DE LA GRASSERIE'S new book I begin to understand the fear entertained by some that anthropology is going to invade the sacrosanct realm of syntax, which belongs, strictly speaking, to the microtomists and the statisticians—otherwise known as Dead Sea Apes. The title of M. DE LA GRASSERIE'S book is a long one and tells the whole story: *Particularités linguistiques des noms subjectifs (Parties du corps, armes et outils, animaux domestiques, noms propres, pronoms)*, Paris, Leroux. It is an entertaining book and a suggestive book, as any anthropological treatise must be, and, if it were not disfigured by typographical and other errors it would be a still more welcome repertory of facts. The abridgment of Fick's Griechische Personennamen is marred by *apocoristique*; which is used throughout the section for *hypocoristique*, although *hypocoristique* does emerge toward the end of the book; and a summary of Mommsen on Latin names shews everywhere *proenomen* for *praenomen*, so that one becomes a little distrustful about the spelling of the examples drawn from Nahuatl, Kalingo, Chibcha, Yaruro and Guarani. The chapter that trenches on syntax—syntax in the wider sense—is the third, *Du lieu subjectif dans l'espace et dans le temps aboutissant au pronomen*, in which stress is laid on the relativity of the demonstrative and the subject. That ὅδε is the pronoun of the first person, οὗτος of the second, ἐκεῖνος of the third is an old story, and it was nothing but whimsicality or the itch of criticism that made Dr. Fennell object to my note on Pindar, O. 1, 115. He must have known better. The phenomenon is widespread, but M. DE LA GRASSERIE touches it lightly and refers us to another work of his on the subject. There are some interesting remarks on the subjectivity of some of the outlying languages, which insist on the expression of personal possession in the inflexion of the noun, as other idioms insist on personality in the inflexion of the verb, languages in which there is no simple 'head' but always 'my head', 'thy head', 'his head'. This insistence on the possessive, this jealousy of *meum* and *tuum*, this sense of justice crystallized in *suum cuique*, comes out very curiously in Homeric Greek. εἰ has to answer for a reflexive, as in old-fashioned English *me*, *thee*, *him*, *her* and *us* have to answer for the reflexive. But the possessive ἐός is always reflexive and asserts itself where it would seem to be unnecessary, as in ὁ πεπλήγετο μηρῷ. In stress of emotion smiting one's self, one's thighs is a natural action. For unnatural action the standard language employs regularly the reflexive pronoun, and it is a mannerism of Euripides to employ it where it is not needed. It introduces an element of conflict. It reminds one of the Frenchman's standing excuse 'c'est plus fort que moi'. This Euripidean finesse crops out in many passages, nowhere more strikingly than in B. 613: αὐτὸς

ἐξέσωσ' ἐμαυτόν. σωθῆναι is the form commonly used for 'escape', σῶσαι ἐαυτόν is employed only in circumstances of especial difficulty, and therefore Dionysos adds in the triumphant consciousness of his divine power—ῥαδίως ἄνευ πόνου. If the reflexive had been further developed in Homeric times it would doubtless have been used in the same way, and there is at least one passage in which the contrast is brought out as clearly as in post-Homeric Greek, Il. 20, 170: οὐρῇ δὲ πλευρὰς τε καὶ ἰσχία | ἀμφοτέρωθεν μαστίγεται, ἐὲ δ' αὐτὸν ἐποτρύνει μαχέσασθαι.

But while M. DE LA GRASSERIE has not treated of the reflexive in his chapter on the pronouns, he has not failed to notice the concrete expression for the first person in 'the Mande negro-languages, Arabic, Provençal, the Germanic languages and Jenessei-Ostiaka (p. 24)', 'my soul', 'my body', 'my head', 'my insides', and out of this we can get a primitive reflexive, which often survives as a popular reflexive. 'Fret not thyself' (μηδ' οὕτως σεαυτὸν ἔσθιε Ar. Vesp. 286) becomes 'Fret not thy gizzard', and 'Bestir thyself' becomes 'Stir your stumps' (κίνησον πόδα); cf. Eur. Bacch. 765. Nothing is more familiar in Greek poetry than this species of synecdoché, and nobody needs to be told of the frequent use of ψυχή, δέμας (later σῶμα), φρήν, θυμός, and all the parts of the body involved in the action, though the extent of this form of the reflexive is not always recognized (Pindar, P. 4, 173). εὐφραίνε θυμόν is not the same as εὐφραίνου. We must add 'for a' that and a' that', as in Mimnermos, τὴν σαντοῦ φρένα τέρπε.

Of course, it could not be expected of M. DE LA GRASSERIE that he should go into a detailed discussion of the syntactical construction of the parts of the body in the many languages that pass before his vision (A. J. P. XXIII 233), and yet the subject is not without interest. So, for instance, we find that in Latin and Greek the genitive and the dative, as it were, Michael and the devil, dispute about the parts of the body. On the whole, it would seem, the genitive is dominant in Greek (A. J. P. XXVII 359), whereas in long stretches of Latin, as in Plautus, the dative seems to have the upper hand. In Greek of the earlier period there might be some dispute as to the conception of the genitive, whether it is possessive or partitive, but when the article is fully established the partitive notion becomes clear with the partitive position; and this partitive feeling thrusts itself upon us when we find the ordinary laws of position violated. So the rule is τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ γαστέρα, τὴν σαντοῦ φρένα, but even here the partitive asserts itself at times, not only in the Aristophanic Pax 880, cf. Fr. 579 (2, 1178 M.): τῇ κεφαλῇ σαντοῦ but also in the Demosthenic ἐμοῦ μὲν ὕβρισε τὸ σῶμα

(XXI 18), which we feel almost as acutely as Demosthenes felt the buffet dealt him by Meidias.

But this reminds me of the contention that *οἱ* is a virtual genitive (A. J. P. XXIII 20), and if this is admitted, havoc would be made of any statistics as to the use of the genitive and dative with parts of the body. The argument from concord adduced by the advocates of the genitiveness of *οἱ* (Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.*<sup>3</sup> p. 248), is not convincing (A. J. P. XXVII 359), and those who reject the adjectiveness of the genitive as proved by Γοργεῖη κεφαλὴ δεινοῖο πελώρου ought not to cite such examples as *Il.* 16, 531: γήθησέν τε | ὅττι οἱ ᾧκ' ἤκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξαμένοιο. Surely σφίσιν is not exposed to confusion with the genitive form, and yet we find *Od.* 6, 155: μάλα πού σφισι θυμὸς . . . λαίνεται, λευσσόντων κτέ. Cp. also *Od.* 14, 527 and the other examples in Monro H. G., § 243, 3 (*d*). But not to make a grammatical treatise out of a passing notice of M. DE LA GRASSERIE'S book, I will allow myself to mention just three points that might find a place in a syntactical treatise on the parts of the body, (1) the so-called dative of the instrument, (2) the accusative of extent (part affected) and (3) the predicative position. All tools are extensions of the parts of the body, and the conception is comitative rather than instrumental. *σύν* is in my judgment a precious document of the primal state of things (A. J. P. XVIII 220). Homer does not refine on the difference between dative and *διά* c. gen. as the philosopher does, simply because he has no *διά* c. gen. in this sense; and the old *αἰοιδός* would not have understood the question of Sokrates in *Theaet.* 184 C: σκόπει γάρ, ἀπόκρισις ποτέρα ὀρθοτέρα,  $\phi$  ὀρώμεν τοῦτο εἶναι ὀφθαλμούς, ἢ δι' οὗ ὀρώμεν κτέ. In my Pindar I have called attention to the fact that the accusatives of the part affected in that concrete poet refer chiefly to the body and its parts (*I. E.* LXXXIX); a significant survival of the rude 'temporary compound' accusative, which is at the bottom of all the accusative uses. And finally when Homer says *ποιόν τὸν μῦθον εἵπες*; trained by our familiarity with prose we recognize the predicative position but as the article is not fully established in Homer, we are left largely to our own devices as to the interpretation, just as in Latin there is no external sign of attributive and predicative. But when the article is established and takes on the un-Homeric possessive connotation, then the predicative position has the parts of the body for its most familiar sphere, just as we say, 'with open hands', 'with hands open', 'with his open hands', 'with his hands open'. Outside the parts of the body, outside a limited phraseological range, the predicative position in Greek is a conscious pose, and must be counted as a mark of a reflective, not to say, affected style. See MILDEN, *The Limita-*

tions of the Predicative Position (J. H. U. Diss.). Another proof, if proof were needed, of the importance of the sphere in every line of syntactical research, and this sphere is at all events no nebulous sphere of will and wish with its outlines at the mercy of every breath of fancy.

---

'Aretalogie des weiblichen Geschlechts' (A. J. P. XXVII 200 footnote) is a stray characteristic of Krüger's Syntax that lodged in my memory many years ago, but whoever coined it, used the word 'Aretalogie' in its etymological rather than its historical sense, which REITZENSTEIN has recently unfolded in his *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (Teubner). ἀρεταλογία is not ἀρετὴν λέγειν but ἀρετὰς λέγειν and ἀρεταί, so often used for 'valorous deeds', for 'deeds of emprise' came to be a technical term for the 'great and marvellous works' of the gods. In the Hellenistic cult of the Egyptian gods of healing ἀρεταλόγος was the regular name for the herald or interpreter of dreams and visions; ὄνειροκρίτης and ἀρεταλόγος were one. Then the word was secularized and Juvenal uses 'aretalogus' for the narrator of strange adventures. The 'aretalogus' fell below the mime; he who might have called himself a psalmist became a 'saltinbanco', a mere buffoon, and made merry over the marvels he told. Now it is to the themes of these aretalogi that REITZENSTEIN has consecrated his new book beginning with the Philopseudes of Lucian. The wealth of learning and the cleverness of combination defy the summarizing process. It is an illuminating book, and bewildering by reason of the illumination. It is a manner of search-light that plays over the whole range of Hellenistic tradition, and like a search-light it is tantalizing in its rapid shift from object to object, to say nothing of the mortification one feels at the dulness of vision that needs the penetrating ray.

---

In his interesting book on *Aristophanes*, M. MAURICE CROISSET maintains that the son of Philippos must have been country bred by reason of his intimate and loving knowledge of country life (A. J. P. XXVII 354). In my judgment all such argumentation, however seductive, is vain. Every true poet has the key of the fields as of everything; and in looking over the fragments of Eupolis the other day, I was reminded by the goats' bill of fare set forth in his *Alyes* of Mr. ALDEN SAMPSON's delightful essay on the *Deer's Bill of Fare*. 'The deer', it seems, 'have a sensitive and cultivated palate. Their food is of the cleanest, most appetizing, and is gathered with every concomitant element of enjoyment for a young and vigorous animal'. The *menu* is of the most bewildering variety, for 'the deer's hobby is food, and

it is *quality*, quite as much as *quantity*, that gives him delight'. Now, the city goat of America is the butt of newspaper scribblers by reason of its omnivoracity. Tin cans and waste paper are the chief of its diet, but that is a goat degraded by domestication. Like the deer, the goat is still a 'creature of versatility'; but in his first estate like the deer he loved and sought—according to Eupolis—the tender shoots of the holmoak and the arbutus, *πρίνου κομάρου τε πτόρθους ἀπαλούς*, and it would be well worth some naturalist's while to study the Eupolidean list and to compare it with the range of the food of the modern Greek goat. The modern Greek goat is truly a Satanic creature. Walking one day along a sunken road of the Peloponnese, I was startled by hearing a sudden rush of animal life. I looked up and a flock of goats hurtled themselves above my head. Never had I appreciated so fully the diabolical eye and the wicked mouth of those sons and daughters of perdition. For all that I should like to know more about their diet, especially if I were going to prove that Eupolis was an observer like Mr. Sampson, or else a goat-herd, and not a scullion, or at least a second cook, as most of his fellow-poets seem to have been, to judge by their loving intimacy with various kinds of human food.

---

Already another edition of DIELS' *Vorsokratiker*, already another edition of SANDYS' *History of Classical Scholarship*—an eloquent practical tribute to the value and timeliness of both books. It seems but the other day that the first editions were reviewed in the pages of this Journal, the former by Professor HEIDEL, A. J. P. XXIV 456-465, the latter by Professor HAMILTON, A. J. P. XXV 447-453; and the Editor is pleased to find that the reviews have told on the new editions. The trouble about such detailed reviews, to which I may add Professor LEASE's notes on the SCHMALZ-KREBS *Antibarbarus*, A. J. P. XXVIII 34-35, is that the inevitable list of errata and omissions tends to depress unduly the merit of the work criticized. Every dictionary is exposed to just such a fire. LIDDELL and SCOTT'S *Lexicon* has been fair game for more than a generation, and it is well enough to impress on the youthful mind that except one's wisdom exceed the wisdom of L. and S. one knows no Greek: still who would give up L. and S., even though one would deprecate the selection of it as the basis of a new *Lexicon*? And so it is not unlikely that the multitude of details in Dr. SANDYS' *Classical Scholarship* still needs correction here and there, but it is a noteworthy achievement, and has won a permanent place in the apparatus of the student. My own sins in the way of criticism are ever before me, and I have tried over and over to make amends for my ungenerous remarks by quoting favorable estimates of the very books, whose 'raw places' I have touched upon; but so far from being malicious, *Brief Mention* is really an evangel

of charity. It teaches in its own way the lesson of human fallibility, and we can all say 'But for the grace of God' And yet—And yet one's anger is sometimes stirred by those who undertake to teach others, and sin in elementary things. What is to be done with an Introduction to Comparative Philology that prints 'empéreur' and is guilty of the notorious *kakemphaton* of 'cum nobis'. It is precisely in beginners' books that absolute accuracy is demanded.

---

D. M. R.: *Die Dipylongräber und die Dipylonvasen* (Leipzig, Teubner) by Poulsen is a German revision of a Danish Habilitationsschrift. The first part, which deals with cremation and gives the results of a careful study of the Dipylon graves at Athens and Eleusis, has been condensed; the second part has been expanded from a résumé to describe in detail the Dipylon vases. Cremation was not as usual as is generally supposed. The ashes found in the Pre-Mycenaean and Mycenaean graves opened by Skias at Eleusis, Poulsen rightly holds, were not of human bones but of burnt wooden huts. In the oldest Dipylon graves yet excavated, those on the slope between the Athenian acropolis and the Areopagus, cremation alone was practised. But at Eleusis burial was three times as common as cremation, and at the Dipylon in Athens four times as common. The statements of Poulsen are built on stronger foundations than the theory of Dr. Dörpfeld who in a recent article on this same subject (*Mélanges Nicole*, p. 95 f.) says that at all times in Greece the dead were first burnt and then interred and that only the degree of burning varied.

In part II Poulsen gives in the first chapter a good account of the "finds" of geometric vases. To his list may now be added the important vases of Mycenaean shapes but with geometric designs found near Kavousi in Crete, those from the Argive Heraeum, and from Phylakopi, and those from Corinth which resemble the earliest geometric ware from Eleusis (cf. *Am. J. Arch.* IX, p. 411 f.). Poulsen derives the decorative motives from the primitive incised geometric of Pre-Mycenaean and Mycenaean times. His theory, however, of a despised "Bauernkeramik", which after the overthrow of the Mycenaean kings was brought to the front again by the "junge eupatridische Adel", seems fanciful and not much better than the Dorian and "textile" theories opposed by him. In the second chapter Poulsen discusses the shapes and decoration of the older Dipylon vases and in the final chapter the later Dipylon vases, including the large funeral amphorae which show oriental influence. The value of Poulsen's monograph lies in the fact that it is the first detailed work on all the Dipylon graves and vases and that it demonstrates a long, though perhaps too complicated, development in the so-called Dipylon style. Wide and Dragendorff had argued that the style was of short duration.

Similar monographs are needed on the other ceramic wares but with numerous illustrations, the lack of which in Poulsen's treatise greatly lessens its scientific value.

---

G. L. H.: A new series of monographs, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, published under the general editorship of Ludwig Traube, promises to be of interest to students in many fields of study. Under the title of Johannes Scottus (pp. X, 106, München, 1906) Dr. E. K. RAND in his contribution to the initial volume gives us for the first time a complete text of the commentaries on the first three and the fifth *Opuscula Sacra* of Boethius, attributed to John the Scot, and extracts from a commentary on the fourth *Tractatus*, probably based upon one by John, which Dr. RAND assigns to Remigius of Auxerre. In his introductions, Dr. RAND presents a good case for their attribution to their several authors, omitting nothing which would strengthen his case. Of most interest, perhaps, is his success in showing that Heiricus of Auxerre was indebted to, instead of being the author of, the older commentary. For a further understanding of the texts which they gloss, these commentaries have their usefulness, but Dr. RAND emphasizes their historical significance. They attest the influence of the *Opuscula Sacra* upon the beginnings of medieval philosophy; the important part played as a forerunner of scholasticism by John the Scot, whose theological and philosophical powers are manifested and confirmed in this work; and the furtherance of his doctrines by immediate successors of the same school. In a word Dr. RAND's work is a contribution to medieval literature, and to the history of Christian doctrine and philosophy.

---

The Concordance Society, originating in a suggestion made by Professor George Herbert Palmer, of Harvard, was organized December 28th, during the session of the Modern Language Association at New Haven, with the following officers:

President—ALBERT S. COOK, Yale University.

Secretary—CHARLES G. OSGOOD, Jr., Princeton University.

Treasurer—CURTIS H. PAGE, Columbia University.

Executive Committee—The officers of the Society, with CHARLES W. HODELL, Woman's College, Baltimore, and ALBERT H. TOLMAN, University of Chicago.

The purposes of the Society are 'to provide subventions toward the publication of such concordances and word-indexes to English writers as shall be considered sufficiently meritorious and necessary; to formulate plans for the compilation of such works; and to assist intending compilers of such works with suggestion and advice'. Members pay five dollars a year, due May 1. Applications for membership are earnestly desired, and may be sent to any one of the officers.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Aristotle. Aristotle on his predecessors: being the first book of his Metaphysics; tr. from the text edition of W. Christ; with introd. and notes by A. E. Taylor. Chicago, *Open Court Publishing Co.*, 1907. 159 pp. 8°, cl., 75 cts.; pap., 35 cts.

Caesar's Gallic war, books I-IV, and selections from books V-VII; with notes by W. B. Gunnison and W. S. Harley. New York, *Silver, Burdett & Co.*, 1907. 35+460 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.25.

Colby (Ja. Waldo). An easy introduction to the old Indian language of the Atlantic coast, Waltham, Mass., *Colby Studio*, 1906, 1907. 200 pp. 16°, cl., \$1.50.

English-Greek and Greek-English dictionary. New York, *Atlantis*, 1907. 12°, cl., \$2.00.

Herodotus. Bks. 4-6; translated by G. W. Harris, of Cambridge University. New York, *Macmillan*, 1907. 165 pp. 12°, flex. cl., \$1 net.

Lucretius. De rerum natura: libri sex; ed. by W. A. Merrill. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1907. 806 pp. 8°, cl., \$2.25.

— De rerum natura: a selection from the fifth book (783-1457); ed. with introd. by W. D. Lowe. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1907. 67 pp. 12°, cl., 50 cts.

Martial. Select Epigrams. Books VII - XII; ed. from the text of Professor Lindsay by R. T. Bridge and E. D. C. Lake. New York, *Oxford University Press*, (Amer. Branch), 1906, 1907. 30+128 pp. 12°, cl., 50 cts.

Plutarch's Lives (Sertorius, Eumenes, Demetrius, Antonius, Galba, Otho); translated by W. R. Frazer, of Oxford University. New York, *Macmillan*, 1907. 244 pp. 12°, New classical lib., flex. cl., \$1 net.

— Greek lives from; newly tr. by C. E. Byles: Theseus, Lycurgus, Aristides, Themistocles, Pericles, Alcibiades, Dion, Demosthenes, Alexander. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1907. 8+232 pp. 16°, cl., 50 cts.

Powell (H. H.) The supposed Hebraisms in the Grammar of the Biblical Aramaic. Berkeley, Cal., *University of California Press*, 1907. 8+55 pp. 4°, pap., 75 cts.

Virgil's Aeneid; tr. by E. Fairfax Taylor; with introd. and notes by J. P. Maine. New York, *Dutton*, 1907. 16°, cl., 50 cts., \$1.

Virgil. The Aeneid of Virgil; tr. into English verse by Ja. Rhoades. New ed. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1907. 12+359 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.25 net.

## ENGLISH.

Annual of the British School at Athens. Nr. II. Sessions 1904-1905. London, 1905. 4°. S. 1905. Nr. 3535. 21s.

Benham (W. G.) Book of Quotations, Proverbs and Household Words. London, 1907. 8°. 1264 pp. 10s. 6d.

Cartwright (B. O.) Elementary Handbook of the Siamese Language. Subscription Edition. London, 1907. 8°. 382 pp. 1£. 4s.

Cornford (F. M.) Thucydides Mythistoricus. London, 1907. 8°. 268 pp. 10s. 6d.

Haywood (A. H. W.) English-Hausa Vocabulary. London, 1907. 12°. 2s.

Renouf (P. le Page). The Life Work. First Series. Vol. IV. The Book of the Dead. Translation and Commentary. Continued and completed by Ed. Naville. Biography of P. le Page Renouf. London, 1907. 8°. CLVII, 398 pp. £1. 5s.

Schiller (F. C. S.) Studies in Humanism. London, 1907. 8°. 510 pp. 10s.

Seidel (A.) Hausa Language, Grammar and Vocabulary. London, 1907. 8°. 4s.

Tucker (T. G.) Life in ancient Athens. London, 1907. 8°. 226 pp. 5s.

## FRENCH.

Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum. Tome V, pars 2. Bruxelles 1907. 8°. 165 pp. 6 fr.

Gollier (Th.) Manuel de la langue japonaise. Tome I. Bruxelles, 1907. 8°. 239 pp. 25 fr.

## GERMAN.

Aeschyli cantica, digessit O. Schroeder. (viii, 120 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 2.40; geb. m. 280.

Alexanderlied, das syrische. Hrsg. u. übers. v. Carl Hunnius. [Aus: „Ztschr. d. deut. morgenländ. Gesellsch.“] (93 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus' Sort*, 1906. m. 2.90.

Anthologia latina. Edd. F. Buecheler et A. Riese. Pars I: Carmina in codicibus scripta recensuit Alex. Riese. Fasc. II: Reliquorum librorum carmina. Ed. II denuo recognita. (vi, 410 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. m. 4.80; geb. m. 5.40.

Cauer (Paul). Palaestra vitae. Das Altertum als Quelle prakt. Geistesbildg. 2., vielfach verb., auch verm. Aufl. (xi, 169 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1907. geb. m. 3.60.

Commentationes Aenipontanae quas edunt E. Kalinka et A. Zingerle. gr. 8°. Innsbruck, Wagner. I. Ausseren (A.) De clausulis Minucianis et de Ciceronianis quae quidem inveniuntur in libello de senectute. (ii, 96 S.) 1906. m. 1.70.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Edd. B. Keil et R. Reitzenstein. Vol. XII. gr. 8°. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. Fasc. 1. Hürth (Xaver). De Gregorii Nazianzeni orationibus funebribus. (vi, 159 S.) 1907. m. 5. Fasc. 2. Reis (Petr.) Studia Tulliana ad „Oratorem“ pertinentia. (101 S.) 1907. m. 3.

Epistulae privatae graecae quae in papyris aetatis Lagidarum servantur, ed. Stanisl. Witkowski. Adiecta est tabula phototypica. (xxvi, 144 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. m. 3.20; geb. m. 3.60.

Geffcken (J.) Zwei griechische Apologeten. (xliii, 333 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 10; geb. m. 11.

Klassikertexte, Berliner. Hrsg. v. der Generalverwaltg. der königl. Museen zu Berlin. Lex. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 5. Heft. Dichterfragmente, griechische. 1. Hälfte. Epische u. eleg. Fragmente. Bearb. v. W. Schubart u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Mit e. Beitrage v. F. Buecheler. Mit 2 Lichtdr.-Taf. (viii, 136 S.) 1907. m. 8.

Möller (Herm.) Semitisch u. Indogermanisch. I. Tl. Konsonanten. (xvi, 395 S.) gr. 8°. Kopenhagen, *H. Hagerup*. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1906. m. 16.

Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio. Ed. Herm. Hitzig, commentarium germanice scriptum cum tabulis topographicis et numismaticis addiderunt Herm. Hitzig et Hugo Bluemner. Vol. III pars. 1. Liber VIII: Arcadica. Liber IX: Boeotica. (viii, 524 S. m. 3 Taf.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*, 1907. m. 20; geb. m. 22.

Philodemi *περὶ οἰκονομίας* qui dicitur libellus, ed. Christian. Jensen. Accedunt duae tabulae phototypicae. (xxxiv, 106 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. m. 2.40; geb. m. 2.80.

Porphyrii sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes. Praefatus, recensuit testimoniisque instruxit B. Mommert. (xxxiii, 56 S. m. 1 Fig.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 1.40; geb. m. 1.80.

Quintiliani, institutionis oratoriae libri XII, ed. Ludovic. Radermacher. Pars I, libros I-VI continens. (xiv, 359 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 3; geb. m. 3.50

Rechtsbücher, syrische. Hrsg. u. übers. v. Eduard Sachau. (In 3 Bdn.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. 1. Bd. Leges Constantini Theodosii Leonis. Aus der röm. Handschrift hrsg. u. übers. (xxv, 224 S.) 1907. m. 16.

Schultz (Wolfg.) Zur Entstehung der Welt nach Hesiod. (27 S.) *Wien, Akadem. Verlag*, 1906. m. 1.50.

Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum. Recens. Theod. Preger. Fasc. II. Ps.-Codini origines continens. Adiecta est forma urbis Constantinopolis. (xxvi, u. S. 135-376). kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907. m. 6; geb. m. 6.60.

Westermann (Diedr.) Grammatik der Ewe-Sprache. (16 u. 158 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *D. Reimer*, 1907. m. 6; geb. 8.

#### ITALIAN.

Serra (Gian Domenico). La genesi della parola. Torino. 8°. pp. 83. L. 5. Studi italiani di filologia classica. Vol. XIV. Firenze. 8°. pp. 484. L. 20.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Alarcon. *Novelas Cortas*. Ed. with notes and vocabularies by W. F. Giese. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906. 90 cts.

Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland. Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte v. Johannes Kromayer. Zweiter Band. Die Hellenistisch-Römische Periode; Von Kynoskephalae bis Pharsalos. Mit 12 lithographischen Karten, 11 Beikarten, 2 Skizzen im Text u. e. Tafel in Lichtdruck. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 18 m.

'Αθηνά. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις 'Επιστημονικῆς 'Εταιρείας. Τόμος 17'. Τεύχος β' γ' δ'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1906.

Bardt (C.) Römische Komödien. Deutsch v. C. B. Zweiter Band. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 5 m.

Bemba Grammar. A Grammar of the Bemba Language as spoken in North-East Rhodesia. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1907. 2s. 6d.

Bock (Ferdinand). Beiträge zur Kaukasischen Sprachwissenschaft. Teil I. Kaukasische Miscellen. Wissensch. Beil. zum Programm der Städtischen Steindammnen Realschule zu Königsberg in Pr., 1907.

Bryant (Arthur Alexis). Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. XVIII, 1907.

Carroll (Mitchell). Greek Women. (Woman: in all ages and in all countries, Volume One), with Illustrations. Printed for Subscribers only by *George Barrie & Sons*, Philadelphia.

Cauer (Paul). *Palaestra vitae*. Das Altertum als Quelle praktischer Geistesbildung. 2te vielf. verb. auch vermehrte Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 3 m. 60 pf.

Corneille (Pierre). *Polyeucte*, Martyr, with Illustrations and Notes by Geo. N. Henning. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1907. 45 cts.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Ed. consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXXVIII. Anicii Severini Boethii operum. Pars I. Isagoge Porphyrii. Commenta. Copiis a Georgio Schepss comparatis suisque usus recensuit Samuel Brandt. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCXVI. 16 m.

Curtius-v. Hartel. Griechische Schulgrammatik bearb. v. Florian Weigel. 2te durchges. Aufl. Wien, *Tempsky*, 1907. geb. 3 k. 10 h.

Davis (William Stearns). A Victor of Salamis. A Tale of the Days of Xerxes, Leonidas and Themistocles. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1907. \$1.50.

De Witt (Norman Wentworth). The Dido Episode in the Aeneid of Virgil. (Chicago Diss.) Toronto, *William Briggs*, 1907.

Donegal, A Dialect of. Phonology and Text. By E. C. Quiggin. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. Baltimore, *Nunn & Co.*, 1906. \$3.

English Dictionary, The Oxford. Ed. by James A. H. Murray. PIPER—POLYGENISTIC. (Vol. VIII). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. Treble section. \$1.90. April 1, 1907.

Farnell (Lewis Richard). The Cults of the Greek States. In five volumes. Vols. III and IV. With Illustrations. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1907. 32s.

Foucart (Paul). Étude sur Didymos d'après un papyrus de Berlin. Extrait des mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. T. XXXVIII. 1<sup>re</sup> Partie. Paris, *Klincksieck*, MDCCCXVII. 7 fr. 50.

Gaffiot (Felix). *Ecqui fuerit si particulae in interrogando Latino usus*. Paris, *C. Klincksieck*, 1907. 3 fr. 50.

Gibb (E. J. W.) Memorial. The Pearl-Strings. A History of the Resúliyy Dynasty of Yemen. By 'Aliyyu'bnu'l-Ḥasan 'El-Khazrejiyy, with translation, &c., by Sir J. W. Redhouse. Vol. I. containing the First Part of the Translation. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*. London, *Luzac & Co.* 8 m. 1906.

Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris. Ed. with Introduction, &c., by Philip Schuyler Allen. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906. 60 cts.

Grasserie (Raoul de la). Particularités linguistiques des noms subjectifs. Paris, *Leroux*, 1906. 6 fr.

Griechische Dichterfragmente. Erste Hälfte. Epische u. elegische Fragmente. Bearb. v. W. Schubart u. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff mit e. Beitrage v. Franz Buecheler (Berliner Klassikertexte. Herausg. v. der Generalverwaltung der Kgl. Museen zu Berlin. Heft V. Erste Hälfte). Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1907. 8 m.

Heaven and the World of Spirits, and Hell From Things Heard and Seen by Emanuel Swedenborg. Boston, *Swedenborg Printing Bureau*. 10 cts.

Homers Odyssee. Schulausg. v. Paul Cauer. II. Teil. 4. Aufl. (Unveränderter Abdr.) Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1905. geb. 1 m. 40 pf.

Janko (J.) Über germanisch ē<sup>2</sup> u. die sog. reduplizierenden Praeterite. Sonderabzug aus: Indogermanische Forschungen. XX Band. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1907.

Jonas (Richard). Übungsbuch zum Übersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Lateinische für Untersekunda. 2 bearb. u. verm. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1906. geb. 1 m. 60 pf.

Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, herausg. v. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt u. E. Kornemann. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1907. Jahresband. 20 m.

Kersten (W.) Lateinisches Elementarbuch für Reformschulen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1907. geb. 3 m.

Kunze (Richard). Die Germanen in der antiken Literatur. E. Sammlung der wichtigsten Textstellen. II Teil. Griechische Literatur. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1907. geb. 1 m. 50 pf.

Leiden. Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary. Ed. by John Henry Hessels. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. Baltimore, *Nunn & Co.*, 1906. \$3.

Logan (J. D.) The Religious Function of Comedy. Toronto, *William Briggs*, 1907.

Livi (Titi). Ab urbe condita Libri XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXX. Ed. Antonius Zingerle. Für d. Schulgebr. bearbeitet v. P. Albrecht. 2 Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1904. geb. 1 m. 80.

— Ab urbe condita Libri I, II, XXI, XXII. Adiunctae sunt partes selectae ex libris III, IV, V, VI, VIII, XXVI, XXXIX. Unter Mitwirkg. v. A. Scheindler, für d. Schulgebr., herausg., v. Anton Zingerle. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. geb. 2 m.

Lucreti (T. L. Cari) De Rerum Natura. Libri sex. Ed. by William Augustus Merrill. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1907. \$2.25.

Μελέτη ('H). Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. ἐν Ἀθήναις. Κατάστημα τοῦ Συλλόγου πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων. τεύχος 20<sup>ον</sup>. Φεβρουάριος, 1907. @ 1 ὀρ.

Modugno (Giuseppe). Il concetto della vita nella filosofia greca. Bitonto. *Garofalo*, 1907.

Möller (Hermann). Semitisch u. Indogermanisch. Erster Teil. Konsonanten. Kopenhagen, *H. Hagerup*. Leipzig, *Otto Harrassowitz*, 1907. M. 16.

Neue Jahrbücher für d. klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. Zehnter Jahrg., 1907. XIX u. XX Bandes 3 Hft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1907.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 1/2. Helsingfors, 1907.

Nilsson (M. P.) Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles. I. Die Poesie. Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. 18 Hft, Würzburg, *A. Stubers Verlag*, 1907. 5 m. 50 pf.

Ovidius. Ausgew. Gedichte. Für d. Schulgebr., herausg. v. H. S. Sedlmayer. 7te Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. 1 m. 80 pf.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1900. Ἀθήνησιν, 1906.

Psalms, The Book of. A Critical and Exegetical commentary on, by Charles Augustus Briggs and Emilie Grace Briggs. Vol. II. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1907. \$3.

Rabenhorst (Max). Der ältere Plinius als Epitomator des Verrius Flaccus. E. Quellenanalyse des 7. Buches der Naturgeschichte. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1907. 3 m.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. IV. Num. 1. Enero de 1907. Universidad de la Habana, 1907.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. Franz Buecheler u. August Brinkmann. N. F. LXII 2. Frankfurt, a/M., *Sauerländer*, 1907.

Richardson (L. J.) Helps to the Reading of Classical Latin Poetry. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1907. 50 cts.

— Horace's Alcaic Strophe. University of California Publications. Classical Philology. Vol. I No. 6. pp. 175-204. March 23, 1907.

Rowland (Eleanor H.) The Psychological Experiences connected with the different Parts of Speech. Monograph Supplement of The Psychological Review. Vol. VIII No. 1. Jan., 1907.

Sanctuaire (Le) de Tanit à El Kénissia par M. le Dr. Carton. Extrait des Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tome XII. 1<sup>re</sup> Partie. Paris, *C. Klincksieck*, MDCCCCVI. 9 p., 20 cts.

Schanz (Martin). Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. Erster Teil. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik. Erste Hälfte. Von den Anfängen der Litteratur bis zum Ausgang des Bundesgenossenkriegs. 3. ganz umgearb. u. stark vermehrte Aufl. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Herausg. v. Iwan v. Müller. Achter Band. Erster Teil. 1 Hälfte. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1907. 7 m.

Scheffel (Von). Der Trompeter von Säckingen. With Introd., &c., by Herbert C. Sanborn. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906. 90 cts.

Schwarz (Ferdinand H.) Nicholas Rowe. The Fair Penitent, with a side-reference to Richard Beer-Hofmann: Der Graf von Charolais. Berne, *A. Franke*, 1907. 1 m. 80 pf.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis:

Asconii (Q.) Pediani Commentarii. Recogn. brevique adnotatione critica instruxit A. C. Clark. 3s. paper.

Hyperidis Orationes et fragmenta. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit F. G. Kenyon. cl., 3s. 6d. Oxonii, *E Typographeo Clarendoniano*, 1907.

Seven Sages of Rome (The). Ed. from the MSS, with Introduction, Notes and Glossary by Killis Campbell (The Albion Series). Boston, *Ginn & Co.* New York, 1907.

Skutsch (Franz). Gallus u. Vergil. Zweiter Teil. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 5 m.

Taciti (P. Cornelii) opera quae supersunt. Recensuit Joannes Müller. Ed. minor. Vol. II. Historias et opera minora continens. Ed. altera emendatio. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*, MDCCCXVI. geb. 2 m.

Tacitus. Die Germania. Herausg. v. J. Müller. Für d. Schulgebr. bearb. v. A. Th. Christ. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1906. 70 pf.

Thulin (Carl). Die Götter des Martianus Capella u. der Bronzeleber v. Piacenza. Mit 2 Abbildungen im Text u. 1 Tafel. Gieszen, *Alfred Töpelmann*-New York, *G. E. Stechert*, 1906. 2 m. 80.

Vahleni (Johannis) Opuscula Academica. Pars Prior. Prooemia Indicibus Lectionum praemissa. I-XXXIII ab A. MDCCCLXXV ad A. MDCCCLXXXI. Lipsiae, *In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, MDCCCXVI.

Vergils Äneis nebst ausgew. Stücken der Bukolika u. Georgica. Für den Schulgeb.; herausg. v. W. Klouek. 6 Aufl. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1907. geb. 2 m. 20 pf.

Weigel (Florian). Kurzgefasste griechische Schulgrammatik. Nach Curtius v. Hartel's Schulgrammatik. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1907. geb. 2 k. 50 h.

Westermann (W. L.) Interstate Arbitration in Antiquity. Reprinted from the Classical Journal, Vol. II, No. 5, March, 1907.